NOVEMBER
1960

THE JOURNAL OF Higher Education

On Colleagues and Clients

The Place of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education

The Ohio State University Press

THE JOURNAL OF Higher Education

ROBERT D. PATTON, *Editor*
EDITH C. RINEHART, *Associate Editor*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

RICHARD D. ALTICK — AURELE LA ROCQUE
DONALD P. COTTRELL — CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE
ROSCOE H. ECKELBERRY — EVERETT WALTERS — ROBERT E. MATHEWS

EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS

JOHN S. DIEKHOFF, FRANK P. GRAHAM, MSGR. F. C. HOCHWALT
E. V. HOLLIS, HENRY W. HOLMES, CHARLES W. HUNT, A. C. KREY
L. C. MARSHALL, J. L. MORRILL, WILLARD C. RAPPLEYE, FLOYD W. REEVES
JOHN SHAPLEY, ORDWAY TEAD, LUTHER WEIGLE, JESSE FEIRING WILLIAMS
C. C. WILLIAMSON, JAMES M. WOOD

THE JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION is published monthly, except during July, August, and September, by the Ohio State University Press, Columbus 10, Ohio, 75 cents a copy, $6.00 a year (Canadian and foreign subscriptions $6.50). Second-class mailing privilege authorized at Columbus, Ohio. Copyright © 1960 by the Ohio State University Press.

NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS: Manuscripts submitted for publication should be original typescripts, double-spaced, on white opaque paper, 8½ x 11.

——— New Books from Ohio State ———

IN THE NAME OF THE PEOPLE

Speeches and Writings of Lincoln and Douglas in the Ohio Campaign of 1859

Edited by
HARRY V. JAFFA
and
ROBERT W. JOHANNSEN

The speeches and writings of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas in the Ohio campaign of 1859 are collected for the first time in this centennial volume. Here the two dominant figures in their parties continue the debates begun in Illinois in 1858 and open the Presidential campaign of 1860. This collection gives an exceptionally clear picture of the three major party positions and the issues which divided the country in the years preceding the Civil War. An extensive introduction contains a description of the setting of the campaign, by Robert W. Johannsen, and an interpretation of the issues, by Harry V. Jaffa.

320 pp. Preface and Introduction $5.00

GEORG SIMMEL, 1858-1918

A Collection of Essays, with Translations and a Bibliography

Edited by
KURT H. WOLFF

In this volume, a group of distinguished scholars analyze the various aspects of the thought of Georg Simmel in a series of essays that do justice to the breadth and depth of his interests in the social sciences, philosophy, art, and religion. Translations of seven key essays from the large body of Simmel's work, together with a definitive bibliography, complete this invaluable collection.

416 pp. Preface $7.50

Order from your bookstore or . . .

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
164 WEST NINETEENTH AVENUE
COLUMBUS 10, OHIO

THE JOURNAL OF

Higher Education

Volume XXXI, Number 8 November, 1960

CONTENTS

On Colleagues and Clients — *Paul Kirkpatrick* 413

The Place of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education: The Responsibility of the Faculty — *S. M. Marco* 422

An Experiment in Political Education — *Blanche D. Blank, Robert S. Hirschfield, and Bert E. Swanson* 428

The Full, Bright Experience — *Jesse Bier* 435

What Price Professors? — *Jahangir Amuzegar* 443

SHORT CONTRIBUTIONS

Closed-Circuit Television as a Teaching Aid — *M. Scheffel Pierce* 451

Technological Aids in College Literature Courses — *Richard H. Byrns* 455

EDITORIAL 458

THE REPORTER 461

REVIEWS — REVIEWER

A Century of Higher Education for American Women — *Thomas Woody* 465

The Decline of American Communism — *Paul A. Varg* 466

From Main Street to the Left Bank — *Margaret Wiley Marshall* 467

The College Influence on Student Character — *Frank C. Abbott* 468

College Student Government — *Byron H. Atkinson* 470

In Grandad's left hand, the Bell System's new electronic larynx.

A new voice for the voiceless

New Bell System electronic larynx restores speech to those who have lost the use of their vocal cords

Helping people to talk again . . . this is a continuing Bell System project which grew out of Alexander Graham Bell's lifelong interest in persons with hearing and speech handicaps.

Now Bell Telephone Laboratories has developed an improved electronic artificial larynx which is entirely self-contained and battery-operated—designed to serve as a "new voice" for many people affected by surgery or paralysis.

When held against the neck, this ingenious 7-ounce device transmits vibrations into the throat cavity which can then be articulated into words. Speech sounds of good intelligibility and improved naturalness are produced.

Two models are being made by the Western Electric Company, manufacturing and supply unit of the Bell System. One simulates a man's voice, the other a woman's. In keeping with the Bell System's long history of public service, the Bell Telephone Companies are making this device available on a non-profit basis. If you would like further information, just get in touch with your local Bell Telephone business office.

This new artificial larynx is another example of how research at Bell Telephone Laboratories serves the public in many ways—in developments used by the world's most modern telephone system—and in inventions which have wide application by outside industries and people in all walks of life.

Held to the throat, the Bell System electronic artificial larynx replaces the vibrations of normal vocal cords to produce speech. Power is turned on and off, and the pitch is varied, by a simple thumb-operated switch.

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION Vol. XXXI No. 8 November, 1960

On Colleagues and Clients

A Teaching Physicist Surveys His Associates

By PAUL KIRKPATRICK

ON EVERY campus of every large university there is a school, or perhaps a department, of education. The scientists hear that it is there, but they do not visit it very often. They are trying to teach the young and are realizing that the job is too hard for them. But while they go on with feelings of partial success, there is, nearby, this company of specialists in the philosophy and technique of the teaching process, and they make no use of them. When physicists are having difficulty with a chemistry problem, they go to the chemists; if they get beyond their depth in mathematics, they know mathematicians who will throw them a rope. Physicists in my home department, on one occasion, were broad-minded enough to seek aid in the department of classical languages, and they came home with their problem solved. In that conference, the word *klystron* was invented. But when we are wondering how to educate, we do not go to the educationists. Do we feel that they do not have the answers, or do we avoid them so as not to incur guilt by association?

I cannot dismiss this odd boycott, as some apparently can, by declaring that 90 per cent of the educationists are fools led by the 10 per cent who are smart rogues. I know some educationists who seem to be as intelligent as physicists and as honest as mathematicians. They do not exalt pedagogical know-how above factual know-what. They do not take pride in producing highly trained but ignorant teachers. They worry about some of the same educational problems that bother the

PAUL KIRKPATRICK *is emeritus professor of physics at Stanford University.* *This article has been adapted by the "Journal of Higher Education" from an acceptance speech he delivered to the American Physical Society and the American Association of Physics Teachers on January 29, 1959, when he was awarded the Oersted Medal. The address originally appeared in the "American Journal of Physics," XXVII (September, 1959), pp. 390–96.*

scientists, but, with a better background in these areas, they worry more constructively. The best of them will agree that many educationists have been bumptious and arrogant, and that their fast-growing field has suffered from quackery and charlatanry. But unless their whole discipline is fraudulent—and I do not believe it is—the rest of us do harm to our own disciplines by exchanging epithets with educationists or by pretending that they do not exist. I think that, sooner or later, teachers of all sorts are going to have to agree that there is some kind of scientific basis possible for what they are trying to do.

Whether or not the educationists know the answers, they are concerned with important questions. What is the real nature of the process of learning? How can one train the mind? Can people be taught to think, and if so how is it done? To what teaching operations are the different types of students susceptible, and how are the various types to be recognized? Everyone who teaches needs the answers, even the man who is a "born teacher," whatever that phrase means. If we do not trust the putative authorities, should we not be doing something else about this need? I think we are drifting. The *American Journal of Physics* prints much about apparatus but less about how to instill the lessons of the apparatus into the student's mind. It prints good expository articles on physics as a science but little that is basic about transmitting that science to the "customers" before us. I am sure that this shortcoming is not the result of the editorial policy; it occurs because those who write for the *Journal*, and I include myself, do not at present know what should be said on these matters.

This argument cannot be dismissed by the ancient slogan of the anti-educationists, "All a teacher needs is to know his stuff." People who talk this way are logically as vulnerable as their opponents in the opposite corner who say, or have been said to say, "All a teacher needs is to know how to teach." Let us not do battle with ridiculous weapons. Knowing your stuff is necessary but not sufficient. Teaching is a matter of operations—one does certain things—and the omniscient professor who does the wrong things, or does nothing, is not teaching. We are not going to find out what the right things are by shallow empirical deductions. We need basic theory, and should at least sympathize with honest people who are trying to develop it even though they cannot claim that they now have it ready for our use. The beginning teacher should try to base his methods upon rational foundations rather than upon traditional practices of the teaching guild, imitation of his own teachers, or selective adoption of methods that seem to suffice.

The aversion that the natural scientists feel toward educationists springs partly from fear that educationists may manage to get control of the licensing of college teachers and compel them, or their successors, to take training under them. If this were a real threat, it would be something to fight against, but I cannot see any prospect at all of such a requirement. There is at present no move on foot among educationists anywhere in America to bring this about.

THE second group of professional neighbors with whom science teachers are sometimes at odds is the research group. Of course, a research man is often a teacher with his research hat on; but there are many teachers who do not possess such a hat, and there are many research men in our universities now who have no teaching responsibilities. I am concerned with the interaction of these two pursuits, teaching and research, in a university or college, and with how they aid or obstruct each other. This is a fairly modern problem, for research has not been uniformly supported by American universities until the present century. Today, research is so generally accepted as one of the great natural functions—if not the main function—of any institution granting higher degrees that it is hard to realize that for centuries universities were just places where teachers taught students. Even in the late nineteenth century, such eminent presidents as Eliot of Harvard, White of Cornell, and Gilman of Johns Hopkins declared that teaching was much more important than investigation, a proposition which at that time was denied nowhere except at the University of Chicago.

But the spirit of research was stirring. This great new function of the universities developed slowly, partly because it was expensive and took staff time, but more because faculties included no great corps of trained enthusiasts for such work. Rowland had said, "You don't need money, you don't need time; all you need is to want to do it." But half a century ago all three favoring commodities (money, time, desire) were in short supply. The leading enthusiasts were the young scientists who had come home from Europe with their dazzling German Ph.D. degrees, but they were few in number for a big country.

Here and there a little research came into the universities, and it would be ridiculous to claim that it did not compete with the teaching function. It is told that when Albert A. Michelson was asked how he managed to get so much good research done, he replied, "By neglecting my students." (That's a practice that did not die with Michelson.) At present, it is the undergraduate student who suffers in such cases. I think that close association of an advanced student with a strong research man can be highly educational in an unsystematic way, quite apart from any conscious didactic operations. It is an apprenticeship. It was even said at Chicago that the best training for a graduate student was to carry water for Michelson. The effect is not precisely teaching, and it is not available in wholesale quantities, but it is good so far as it goes. Some of the greatness of Socrates seems to have rubbed off on his student Plato, and it was not transferred by the lecture system, for Socrates did not believe in the lecture system. But it does an undergraduate little good to sit in the presence of a scientist of reputation unless the great man says or does instructive things. This he may or may not do, like any other teacher.

When teaching moved over to make room for research—around 1900—some educators and scientists who believed strongly in both activities tried to play down the mutual-interference effects. These

coexistentialists advanced three propositions. First, every good research man is *ipso facto* a superior teacher. Second, it is not possible for a non-research man to be a superior teacher. Third, the partnership of research and instruction is always mutually beneficial. I do not think that these assertions were inductions from any real observations; they were, I believe, merely articles of faith, adopted, not derived. I am afraid the weight of the observations is against them all, but they were attempts—wistful, perhaps—to deal with a real problem which is still unsolved: the problem of promoting the mutually helpful coexistence of instruction and investigation in science.

SINCE these three claims may still be heard occasionally, let us take a closer look at them. The first one was strongly worded by President David Starr Jordan, who said, "I very much doubt if any really great investigator was ever a poor teacher." Seemingly President Jordan had not heard of the case of Willard Gibbs, who is said to have failed so completely as a teacher at Yale that there was a movement to replace him. We have all been graduate students, and most of us can remember sitting before at least one honored—and justly honored—research scientist who for one reason or another was unsuccessful in the classroom. Possibly he did not care for people; perhaps he was just naturally inarticulate; it may be that he was bored with teaching, and considered it an unimportant part of a job that he had accepted mainly to be able to do his research. Fortunately, a scholar of this type no longer need suffer in the classroom. He can now get a better job requiring the full-time use of his highest talents.

I am not suggesting that there is any negative correlation between effectiveness in research and in teaching, but only that the positive correlation is a long way from unity. The brilliant critic José Ortega y Gasset wrote, "I have lived close to a good number of the foremost scientists of our time, yet I have not found among them a single good teacher."[1] To me this is incredible testimony. I have also lived close to some top scientists, and I am sure there were top teachers among them, judged according to any definition or test one might devise.

I turn to the claim that a man not doing research, or not eager to do research, can never be a superior teacher. The affirmative argument holds that one never really understands the inwardness of physical phenomena, the treachery of glib but plausible explanations, never grasps the reasons behind the reasons, until he digs clear to the bottom of extant knowledge and then a little deeper. This argument sometimes maintains that book learning is fine if you want verbal knowledge, but research people are doers of the word and not hearers only. The superior teacher should have buried himself in the physical mysteries and drawn out the truth with eyes, ears, tactual nerve endings, and the sense of smell.

[1] *Mission of the University* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1944), p. 92.

Now, I do think that experience in research has improved many a teacher's comprehension of the nature of science and greatly deepened his understanding of specific problems. But science is long, life is short, and research is narrow. There is not time enough to master the whole of physics, for instance, through direct research experience, and the detailed insight that a man has time to secure in this way will rarely be passed on to his students unless he is giving a seminar in his research specialty. Any teacher of a general physics course who devotes more than fifteen minutes of lecture time to his own research may be suspected of egotism.

I am worried about how the intensive research specialist finds time to understand the rest of his field. Nowadays, we have a class of bright young Ph.D.'s who, in physics, for example, have managed to become familiar with the inside of a nucleus but are ignorant of the inside of a voltmeter. As teachers we all need perspective. We need to know where the frontier of physical knowledge lies and how the fight for its expansion is going on in the various sectors. A man who is intensely preoccupied with the tactics of one sector may have less chance to see the whole situation clearly than will an equally earnest and intelligent man who pulls out of the fight and merely studies it from headquarters.

This, after all, is about what the theoretical physicist does. Instead of performing experiments, he reads and thinks and talks about the experiments of other people. Surely we have theorists who have gained an enviable comprehension of physics by this process, and I doubt that you can find an experimentalist so well informed as to feel superior to them all. The method of the theorist—that is, mastering science by reading literature instead of meters—is open to every teacher who lives near a library, to the degree permitted by his mentality, his temperament, and, of course, his time commitments. If his thinking leads him to formerly unrecognized truths, then he is a research man; but his teaching is benefited whether his study has this by-product or not. The teacher who chooses this method of learning has no reason to believe, I should say, that his colleague who reads meters has a superior pipeline to the sources of enlightenment. To point out that many research men are superb physicists and draw the conclusion that doing research per se made them that way is to commit a logical fallacy.

NOW a word about the third axiom that I quoted—the statement that the association of instruction and research necessarily benefits both. It is easy to point out that each depends upon the other, for it was research that gave the teacher something to teach; but without the teacher's support, research would die out tomorrow for a lack of trained workers. Yet beyond this broad interdependence, some individual scientists have found the combination advantageous in their own lives. Hans Christian Oersted discovered electromagnetism while in the very act of demonstrating before an audience. Sir J. J. Thomson writes in his autobiography that the bright, inquiring minds of students kept him from settling into

fixed mental postures, and their questions sometimes stirred him to think thoughts conducive to discovery. Well, everyone wishes it might always work this way, but does it? I think not. In the life of a university department, the interests of research and of teaching are competitors. I do not mean to say that people within a department must necessarily engage in controversy with each other in the promotion of these rival activities, though this may happen. I simply mean that the activities themselves are in necessary conflict in any department which thus seeks to serve two masters. These activities compete for room space, for the working time of staff members, including mechanicians and secretaries, for funds, and for the control of faculty appointments.

In my own experience the demands of research and of teaching have been in continual conflict for nearly forty years, and I cannot remember that either function ever helped the other. Many a demonstration would have been better prepared, and many a student better served, if the urgency of some situation in the research laboratory (and the fascination of it) had not pulled in that direction. On the other hand, the continuous concentration that a research dilemma can demand was often broken up by the class bell. I would have done better at either one of these activities if I had kept out of the other, and I suspect that there are hundreds of scientific men who could give the same testimony. This is not a situation we can take satisfaction in; it is just one of the facts of academic life.

To get the American universities solidly into research required some slighting of the teaching function, as I said earlier. President Harper at Chicago announced that the promotion of faculty members would "depend more largely upon the results of their work as investigators than upon the efficiency of their teaching," thus reversing the policies of great presidents of the preceding generation. This declaration seems a wide-open invitation to the faculty to neglect their students, and a justification of Michelson's method. I believe the Harper policy (supremacy of research) is now in effect, practically speaking, in nearly all the large universities of this country, though in some of them the public statement is made that teaching and research are treated as equals. As a matter of fact, presidents and trustees, whatever their statements, cannot control such policies; these issues are managed at the departmental level, where the real work is done and where requests for appointment and promotion originate.

For two generations now, university research has received indulgent consideration, and its prosperity has been paid for in part by other university functions. Perhaps that is the only way it could have been established. Like an infant industry, research has benefited from certain protective tariffs. It is no longer an infant, and it is in no need of further protection. When D. L. Webster went to Stanford forty years ago, he surveyed the university junk yard for raw material before planning the details of his research equipment. Now the same department has in the planning stage one research project whose budget may equal that of the entire present university. There was an infant that grew up!

It is high time to swing the protective tariff back from the researcher to the teacher as teacher. The situation is particularly serious in physics. We need not go all the way back to the nineteenth century, but perhaps we should return to a status appropriate to the needs and conditions of our times. First among these conditions is the fact that research in physics now has its cloud of ministering angels; but there are some additional, supporting considerations. The switch to the aid of teaching I suggest is due at the several levels of instruction in physics because no one seems to want to teach physics in the high schools, because the instruction offered in colleges and universities is not attracting enough specializing students to meet the public need, because recruitment of well-qualified physics teachers for colleges and universities has become very difficult in the face of competition from better-paying employers, because universities are unable or disinclined to train teachers for colleges, and because industries are now able to recruit physicists directly from college and university faculties.

THERE is one other category of people that scientists deal with: the students. They are our best customers; they crowd in upon us with their immense demand for our product; they pay their money and accept what we give them—most uncritically—and they seem especially pleased when we give them short weight. I know of no case in an American college in which the students have protested the announcement of a holiday or organized a demand for longer and harder problem sets. That can't happen here.

I believe that in many universities and institutes we have been taking advantage of the student's poor business sense and giving him less than his money's worth. I am thinking of the institutions of high repute in which a part of the teaching—indeed, the most direct and personal part of it—is entrusted to amateur teachers and often to absolute beginners. This is the unmentioned skeleton in the closet of higher education. Most of our students have come up from childhood without ever being placed under the care of untrained teachers until they begin to meet them in university science laboratories and quiz sections. Uncritical as students are, some of them do think it strange that they have had only trained and experienced teachers in the free public schools but some teachers who were complete novices in prestigious, high-tuition institutions.

If one thinks of a laboratory instructor as merely a proctor who keeps order in the room where a group of students are pursuing their independent work, then of course one sees no objection to turning the job over to a first-year graduate student. But the laboratory is one place where student and teacher become acquainted; it is the place where the teacher can dispense his merchandise at retail or, in a different figure, where he can prescribe for his patients as individuals who may be suffering from slightly different complaints.

Many teachers are outside the system I am criticizing, for many liberal-arts colleges have no graduate students, and therefore the teachers

have to do the teaching. I have long believed that this is a real point of superiority for the four-year colleges, and it may have had something to do with the demonstrated ability of some of them to surpass big universities in the preparation of students for graduate training in the sciences. But in some of the colleges one can find the still weaker practice of using undergraduate students (Seniors) as teachers.

Teaching assistantships used to be justified as a means of subsidy for the graduate students. It is not certain that the tuition-paying undergraduate would consider this a valid defense, but it is certain that the graduate student of today is not in as great need of this assistance as were his predecessors. There has been a vast increase in the number of agencies competing for a chance to aid him. Is it too much to hope that the universities will some day relieve the graduate student of his teaching duties, put a better-qualified teacher in his place, and then—in case the graduate student really wants to learn about college-level teaching—take serious steps to train him?

I have called the student first a customer and then a patient, but I really think of him as a client. We do not impersonally market a product, nor do we impose a professional prescription that the recipient is bound to swallow without question. We offer counsel that the client may be persuaded to act upon. If the counsel is to be good, it needs no emphasis that the counselor must be learned and in a state of ever increasing learning. But getting the client to respond and comply requires a professional relationship that I shall call rapport. It is as important to the teacher's success as is his knowledge or his apparatus. It becomes more difficult to achieve this rapport as enrollments go up. For the master with a few disciples, rapport is easy; for the radio or TV teacher, it is impossible. Most teachers stand somewhere in between. Rapport means knowing the state of ignorance of the student, and of the class, so that one does not explain the obvious nor yet the incomprehensible. A teacher must sense what goes on in the minds of his students or he will not know what to say to them. Rapport means knowing the student's question as soon as he opens his mouth to ask it. When a teacher is greatly surprised by the results of an examination, finding that the class has done far better or worse than he expected, he stands convicted of faulty rapport. He should have known what they would be able to do. When he is astounded by a student's ignorance, he reveals that he has not been on the job; and the teacher who indulges in sarcasm about a student's stupidity is unnecessarily exposing his own.

Once upon a time, a university known to me invited a learned man to serve as visiting professor, and after a few weeks it became evident, from the students' complaints, that the visitor was not making himself understood in his lectures. The department head then discussed the situation with him and suggested that he adjust his presentation to the immaturity or inadequate preparation of the class. The visiting professor

took the suggestion as an affront to his honor, and with a show of dignity he said, "What you ask is impossible! *I* have standards."

This was a case in which, with the best of intentions, a teacher addressed himself to a class that existed only in his own imagination, and consequently he never achieved any harmonious contact with the real people sitting before him. Ever since that experience, the department has checked every candidate for appointment as visiting lecturer to make sure that it does not appoint another man who has standards. Standards, they will tell you, are something to be kept in the National Bureau.

THE scholar's associates are here to stay, if only because human nature abhors a vacuum. The teacher cannot be a recluse, because society is his medium, and research scholarship was a co-operative enterprise—and modestly so recognized by its greatest heroes—long before the research teams of our generation were ever conceived or sponsored. It would be agreeable to extend this survey to cover the contacts of the teaching physicist with academic administrators, the national government, and the general public, but time and space forbid. The fascinating larger subject of the ecology of scholars must be left to investigators who have the requisite breadth for its pursuit.

The Place of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education

The Responsibility of the Faculty

By S. M. Marco

IN THE early stages of development, activities in the field of intercollegiate athletics were predominantly the concern of undergraduates. As a result of the growth of universities and alumni associations, and because of the size and complexity of intercollegiate affairs, these activities have become the concern of many different groups, not all of which are connected with colleges or universities. In addition to the influence of students, alumni, administrators, faculties, and athletic staffs, pressure is exerted directly and indirectly by sports writers, editorial writers, legislators, business groups, and the general public. Some of the objectives of these various groups are the same, but others conflict.

Because these groups have varied interests and differ in the degree of success they have achieved in exerting their influence, the present rules and regulations for the government of intercollegiate athletics are compromises which seem to satisfy none of them. In addition, many of the practices followed in the conduct of the affairs of intercollegiate athletics are inconsistent with the stated objectives and ideals first set forth by the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives (the controlling body of the Western Conference) and later reaffirmed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (the regulating body of a large number of associated colleges and universities in this country).

The primary ends which athletic competition should serve, as stated by these bodies, are as follows:

> (1) To supplement and broaden modern education. In order to take full advantage of opportunities of intercollegiate sport to this end the entire intercollegiate sport program should be made a definite part of the general educational scheme. (2) To promote the all round welfare of an increased number of participants—physical (health, motor skills), recreational (pleasure in sport), social (increased "social insight," good will), moral and spiritual (strengthening of essential attitudes and behavior through illustration and practice). (3) To strengthen by illustration and example individual, university and public conceptions of sportsmanship (group, sectional, national, international: regard for

S. M. Marco *is chairman of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Ohio State University. Mr. Marco has had no official connection with the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. This article is written solely from the point of view of an interested faculty member.*

player or adversary in victory or defeat, proper balance in victory, courage in defeat, fairness of attitude), team play, clean and healthful living, true winning spirit (tenacity, honesty of purpose), self-control, self-confidence, citizenship (respect for rules of game under stress, and for wise discipline and authority), fortitude. (4) To develop group consciousness, morale and spirit in the sense of loyalty to the institution, and to fellow members of the college community. (5) To reflect through representation the spirit of the institution (intellectual ability and achievement, moral tone and idealism, genuine sportmanship through behavior and conduct).[1]

This list of commendable objectives may be condensed to the statement that intercollegiate athletics should be a proper part of the general educational scheme, and that the intellectual, physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of the participants is of great importance. Unfortunately, the pressures existing in several of the areas of intercollegiate athletics have made it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to realize these objectives or to live up to the stated ideals under the type of control which now exists. Furthermore, these pressures have apparently made it impossible for the governing bodies to conform strictly to the rules and regulations which they themselves have developed and to which they have agreed. For example, the Handbook of the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives clearly states that "only institutions having full and complete faculty control of athletics may hold membership in the Conference." The fact is that a significant number of the member institutions do not have "full and complete faculty control" and therefore should not be eligible to hold membership. Since these ineligible institutions do hold membership, it is apparent that control of athletics is not in the hands of the faculties. The making of rules and regulations in this conference is a function of the faculty representatives, who are appointed in most cases by the institutional administrators or by boards or councils which in turn are appointed by institutional administrators. Naturally, then, the faculty representative is more often than not an individual who is interested in athletics and athletic affairs to a much greater degree than the average faculty member, and, as a consequence, is much more likely to reflect the views of the athletic directors and athletic staffs than those of the academic faculty whom he is supposed to represent. As a consequence, the rules which are developed, and the administration and enforcement of these rules, have resulted in an inordinate emphasis on the financial and public-relations aspects of intercollegiate athletics (both of great importance to administrators and athletic staffs) while permitting practices which are not in the best interests of the students.

AT THIS point one might well ask who should be responsible for the control of intercollegiate athletics. Certainly, institutional administrators who are responsible ultimately for the conduct of the affairs of their institutions have a legitimate interest in this area, and certainly they are

[1] "Athletic Sports," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1957), Vol. II, p. 620.

men of integrity who subscribe to the objectives stated in the preceding paragraphs. Also, the athletic directors and the members of athletic staffs, who are professionally trained and who are ultimately answerable for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics in the field, must be granted a large share of interest in the molding and shaping of these activities. Whereas the legitimate interests and responsibilities of these two groups are obvious to the general public, it has difficulty in understanding why faculty members also have a legitimate interest and responsibility in this area. Many motives have been attributed to faculty members who have had the temerity to suggest that the control of intercollegiate athletics is an area of responsibility for academic faculties and that perhaps the present situation is not perfect. They have been accused of being "anti-athletics," "oddballs," "fuzzy-headed intellectuals," "power-hungry publicity seekers," and other kinds of undesirables. For the most part, these accusations are made by sports writers or others who have access to mass media of communication but are not connected with academic institutions and in many cases are insufficiently informed about their objectives and purposes. Too frequently, however, these charges are made by persons who are connected with academic institutions and should know better.

The reason for the legitimate interest and the responsibility of faculties in the control and conduct of intercollegiate athletics has been given earlier in this paper in the statement of objectives to be served by athletic competition set forth by the Western Conference and the NCAA. The concept of intercollegiate athletics as a proper part of the general educational scheme, and the importance of the intellectual, physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of the participants, make this area a responsibility of academic faculties. Educating students to become doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, scientists, writers, historians, and so on, is an important responsibility of the academic faculty, but their chief responsibility is to develop adults who are capable of exercising rational judgment and discriminating between what is right and what is wrong; who have developed a basis for determining the good course of action instead of the bad, and will exert their influence in the direction of the good course. If our university and college faculties train the world's best scientific, technical, and professional men and women but neglect the development of their capacity to seek and select proper values and courses of action in all their pursuits, they will have done mankind a serious disservice. Although much can be done to develop attitudes and capacities in the classroom, a far more powerful force is the example set in the conduct of affairs by the faculty, the administrators, and others connected with the university. A student is in attendance at a university or a college during a period in which some of the most important traits of his character are being formed. Many of the attitudes he develops while he is in the university community will persist for the rest of his life.

The question arises, What has this to do with the responsibility of faculties for the control of intercollegiate athletics? The answer lies in

the fact that although the control and administration of these activities are the legitimate responsibility of all three groups, the administrators, the athletic staffs, and the faculties, only the faculty is essentially free from the pressures which have made it impossible to realize the desirable objectives of intercollegiate athletics. In the opinion of this writer, only academic faculties can afford to be altruistic and objective about these activities. And only the influence of objective and altruistic attitudes can offset the pressures which bring about the many undesirable aspects of intercollegiate athletics.

Institutional administrators, regardless of their own ideals, are subject to many pressures. The effects of the financial and public-relations aspects of intercollegiate athletics loom large in their area of responsibility. The opinions of influential small groups and individual friends of the institution are a continual source of concern. Winning teams and individual athletes who can draw crowds big enough to finance large athletic staffs and plants, and attract favorable local and national attention to their athletic superiority, are considered important to the general welfare of their institutions. For these reasons, it is almost impossible for administrators to be entirely objective. They are forced to make realistic compromises.

Athletic staffs feel compelled to produce winning teams, and, to do so, they must obtain the best possible talent. This attitude has been forced upon them by the external pressure brought to bear on them by many of the same groups that bring pressure on the administrators. Moreover, they are the victims of their own activities in competing with their counterparts at other institutions for the services of talented athletes. At the present time, their professional lives are actually dependent on their producing winners at almost any cost. This fact alone makes it almost impossible for them to approach the problems of intercollegiate athletics with objectivity.

Academic faculty members, as a general rule, are not personally involved with the groups which are prone to exert pressure for bigger and better athletic plants and bigger and better teams. Nor do they feel that their success in their professional fields is intimately connected with victory on the athletic field. It is possible for them, by virtue of their training and inclination, to consider the welfare of student-athletes as their first and foremost responsibility in the area of athletics. It is also possible for them to recognize that athletes and other students derive definite benefits from properly conducted programs of intercollegiate activities, and that all students are injured when these programs are not properly conducted.

IN SPITE of the Western Conference requirement that member institutions have full and complete faculty control of intercollegiate athletics, the fact is that control is in the hands of administrators and athletic staffs. The importance of the financial and public-relations aspects of intercollegiate athletics to these groups has been responsible to a large

extent for the kinds of practices which many faculty members consider contrary to the stated objectives of the athletic associations, particularly with respect to the welfare of the student.

We are presently in the position of paying lip service to the educational values of participation in games and at the same time sacrificing everything we believe in to achieve the unattainable goal of perfection in athletic performance. The compulsion to win victory on the field has led to all the evils of high-powered recruiting practices. An outstanding athlete, young and highly impressionable, cannot help but become possessed with his own importance when scores of colleges bid for his services. He cannot fail to be impressed by the knowledge that some of the bidders are willing to close their eyes to the existing rules regarding recruitment. He is further impressed by the fact that when infractions of the rules are discovered, and sanctions against the offenders are invoked, the administrators and athletic staffs responsible for the violations are prone to resort to the plea that they are being punished for practices which everyone else follows. The implication is that they were at fault, not in committing the act, but in being caught. The standard public statement of the authorities of an institution on whom athletic associations have imposed sanctions is, "We do not agree with your findings, but we will abide by your decision." What kind of impression does this make on the student-athletes—indeed, on all the students—of such an institution?

In many cases the desire to win at any cost has led to "dirty" playing. When very flagrant violations are protested, the usual result is that the violator's coach issues a public statement that the offending athlete was not intentionally breaking the rules but was carried away by his enthusiasm. To the best of this writer's knowledge, no athlete has ever been expelled for an infringement of the rules, and no coach has ever been fired for permitting it. Here, again, the inference seems to be that the disgrace is not in being unethical or resorting to illegal practices but rather in getting caught. Once more, we are setting the student an example which leads him to the conclusion that it is proper to get away with what you can. These examples are only a few of the many instances in which lack of proper control has an adverse effect on the student's moral welfare.

The necessity to win and to produce revenue has led to longer playing seasons, a heavier schedule of games, an increase in the number of post-season contests, and longer and harder practice sessions, all of which must have a profound effect on the student-athlete's physical well-being and—what is assumed to be his major objective—his education. Certainly, protracted playing seasons and long, hard practice sessions cannot help but reduce the athlete's efficiency as a student and consequently have a lasting effect on the quality of his education.

Two fairly recent experiences show that these conditions have had a profound influence on the moral fiber of some of our young athletes. In the not too distant past, a large percentage of the members of the football

team of one of our prominent military academies had to be expelled for cheating on examinations, and a shocking number of the nation's finest basketball players in a large university were prosecuted for accepting bribes to control the scores in games. A survey covering a nine-year period at William and Mary College gives some indication of the effect of the conditions which prevail in intercollegiate athletics on the student's educational goals.[2] It showed that only 32.2 per cent of the football players graduated as compared with 55.9 per cent of the general student body; this in spite of the fact that as a general rule athletes select the less demanding curriculums.

WHO is responsible for this situation? All segments of a university must share the blame: the administrators, the athletic staffs, and the faculties. Every faculty member who is too busy or too uninterested to be concerned with these matters or who takes the attitude that they are not in his province or that there is nothing he can do about them is at fault.

Fortunately, some faculties have become sufficiently aware of their responsibility to exert their influence to improve the situation. In 1956 the Ohio State University faculty recommended action to ensure a greater measure of faculty control, which was approved by its board of trustees. Faculties of other member institutions of the Western Conference have begun to show signs that they, too, agree with the first statement of the section on Membership and Representation of the Handbook of the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives, which was quoted earlier, namely, that "only institutions having full and complete faculty control of athletics may hold membership in the Conference." The activities of certain faculty representatives and athletic directors designed to eliminate faculty control, such as the secret meetings of these groups held in October and November of 1959, are being resisted by some faculties.

I wish it were possible to report that conditions are improving, but this would not be true. At the present time, the faculties distrust the motives of the existing controlling bodies, on the one hand; and the athletic directors and their staffs distrust the motives of the faculties, on the other. It was for this reason that in January, 1960, the Faculty Council of the Ohio State University requested that a constitutional convention be held to draw up a constitution for the operation of the governing body designed to control intercollegiate athletics in the Western Conference. Such a constitution is essential in clarifying the responsibility and the function of the various groups that must have a voice in the control of intercollegiate athletics if we are ever to work our way out of the undesirable conditions imposed by more and more ambitious programs. These conditions have been increasingly detrimental to the educational ideals to which we are all dedicated. If they are permitted to continue, universities with large intercollegiate athletic programs will inevitably be powerless to perform an important educational obligation.

[2]Richard I. Miller, *The Truth about Big-Time Football* (New York: William Sloan Associates, Inc., 1953).

An Experiment in Political Education

An Empirical Research Project Conducted at Hunter College

By BLANCHE D. BLANK, ROBERT S. HIRSCHFIELD, and BERT E. SWANSON

IN A recently published statement, *College Standards for Political Education*, it was pointed out that

> knowledge of politics in modern society must go beyond the traditional historical, legal, descriptive, and institutional approaches to the subject. These, although valuable, are incomplete—and sometimes sterile—without the refreshment of reality to be found in empirical and analytical studies.[1]

Such reality-oriented studies as the one quoted here supplement classroom instruction, enrich the student's understanding of his textbooks, and provide him with a sense of personal involvement which gives impetus to the learning process. By encouraging the student to take a permanent interest in public affairs, they also help to produce that indispensable ingredient of a democratic society, the intelligent, alert, and responsible citizen.

Field work in politics is not the only means of achieving these goals (internship programs in legislative offices or administrative agencies may serve the same purposes), but, for any large group of students, empirical investigation of political life is probably the best way to connect and integrate the theoretical and practical aspects of political science. Moreover, although undergraduate education emphasizing field work is open to the criticism that research cannot be fruitful without intensive training in social-science methodology and extensive background in the subject-matter to be studied, empirical studies may also be viewed as an excellent way of introducing students to these aspects of the discipline at an early stage of their academic careers. Even if the value of field work is accepted, the formulation of a program in which undergraduates may pursue empirical research is not an easy task. There is, first of all, the problem of finding a project broad enough in scope to allow for mass

[1]Earl Latham, with Joseph Harris and Austin Ranney (New York: Citizenship Clearing House, 1959), p. 4.

BLANCHE D. BLANK *and* ROBERT S. HIRSCHFIELD *are assistant professors, and* BERT E. SWANSON *is an instructor, in the Department of Political Science at Hunter College of the City of New York.*

participation, yet meaningful enough to assure a stimulating experience for each participant. In addition, the project must be of such a nature that students with limited backgrounds will comprehend both the subject-matter and the methods of the experiment. Finally, the project must involve the student personally and actively, while recognizing the limits of time and energy imposed by the total college curriculum.

Thus there are difficulties as well as benefits in connection with college-level field research, and both were demonstrated by an experiment in political education which the Hunter College Department of Political Science conducted during the 1959–60 academic year. The Department's major aim was to provide students in the introductory course with a vital educational experience outside the classroom which would stimulate their interest in government, politics, and political science. Departmental resources, in terms of money and faculty time, were very limited, and there was the additional problem of including students from two widely separated campuses (Hunter is located in both Manhattan and the Bronx) in the experiment. On the other hand, at the door of the College lay one of the richest fields for empirical studies in the country, for New York is an area of great political consciousness and activity: virtually every one of America's racial, religious, national-origin, and socio-economic groups is represented in large numbers within its borders; and its political structure, which includes three operating parties, is enlivened by an internal struggle within the dominant party.

COGNIZANT of all the problems that a research experiment might encounter, but encouraged because of its potential value for the participants, the Department decided to undertake a large-scale project which would allow undergraduates to plan, conduct, and evaluate a study of political activists in this heterogeneous community.

Chosen as the subjects for study were the committeemen of the three parties in New York County (Manhattan)—Democratic, Republican, and Liberal. This particular "universe" was selected for a variety of reasons. Numbering over 7,000, the group provided sufficient raw material for a project involving a large number of students. As elected party officials, the committeemen would (at least theoretically) be active, influential, and knowledgeable persons; and since they all resided in New York County, they would be accessible to the students. Moreover, they could easily be identified, because their names and addresses are on public record. It was also decided that the core of the project should consist of interviews with a sample of these political activists, since this would make it possible to develop a questionnaire which the student could use, provide a common basis for evaluation of data, and establish direct contact with the subjects.

Having made these decisions, the Department set up a faculty committee to administer the experiment. This committee began immediately to organize the participating students on two levels of activity:

(1) primary researchers and (2) supervisory or control personnel. Over two hundred students in the introductory course (who had been invited to enter special experimental sections during the registration period) formed the first group; about forty upperclassmen who were taking elective courses in state and local government and in political parties, the second. A "hard core" volunteer staff of Seniors majoring in the Department was selected to direct various phases of the project. Committee headquarters were established in the social-sciencela boratory rooms at each of the College's two centers. One class period a week was set aside in the special sections of the course (which met three times weekly) for project work; the other two sessions were reserved for regular academic pursuits.

The important project operations consisted of devising the questionnaire, administering it to a properly selected sample of the county committeemen, and coding and analyzing the data collected. Class discussion of the kinds of information which might be elicited from the respondents and of the problems involved in devising an interview instrument resulted in agreement that the questionnaire should be designed to reveal a "character picture" of the committeemen, including not only demographic information but also data regarding motivation, participation, policy attitudes, and personality. On the basis of these discussions and their own experience, the faculty committee formulated an 86-item questionnaire, taking care to limit the number of open-ended questions in order to minimize the possibility of misinterpretation by untrained interviewers.[2] A group of supervisory students conducted a pre-test of the instrument and worked with the faculty on its final revision. The faculty committee also obtained informal approval of the project from the County Leaders of the three parties in the hope that this would improve the students' chances of obtaining their interviews.

Meanwhile, a small group of students was engaged in selecting the sample to be interviewed. Having discussed the problems and possibilities of selection, they obtained the lists of committeemen from the Board of Election Commissioners and made the selection by systematic sampling.[3] The names, addresses, and election districts were entered by party on different-colored index cards. The student directors of the project then drew up master lists and allocated interviewing assignments. Each upper-class supervisor received a packet containing the names of five student interviewers and the materials for each. These materials—a letter of introduction, the questionnaires, and post-interview evaluation sheets—were then distributed to each interviewer along with

[2]The questionnaire sought the following information: demographic characteristics (age, education, income, occupation, length of residence, and so on); extent of participation in the party, community, and social and political organizations; policy attitudes concerning party candidates, race relations, and public affairs; and political-personality measurements (manipulativeness, sociability, liberalism-conservatism, the *F*-scale, contemptuousness, morality, self-society, value achievement, civic duty, political efficacy, views on politics, and urbanism).

[3]A 20-per cent sample of the Democratic, Republican, and Liberal party committee lists was taken.

the list of county committeemen with whom he was to get in touch. The committeemen were allocated in such a way that each student could interview representatives of at least two parties. While these organizational tasks were being completed, a letter explaining the purpose of the project and asking for co-operation was sent to each prospective respondent.

When all preparations were completed, in early November, the faculty committee held a series of briefing sessions, first for the upper-class supervisory students, and then for the students who were to take part in the actual interviewing. At this time, a sheet outlining the purposes of the study and a four-page pamphlet on how to obtain and conduct the interview (both prepared by the faculty members) were distributed to the interviewers. The students were given time to make a dry run on family or friends prior to the actual interviewing, and were advised to begin getting in contact with their prospective respondents by telephone. Within a few days, students were conducting their first interviews, and the project was in operation.

The interviewing was scheduled to continue for three weeks (it was finally extended to four), and during this period three supervisors organized a telephone squad to help students who were having difficulty in obtaining their interviews. Interviewers were told to take problems first to their supervisors. The supervisors could appeal for assistance to the student directors. The final resort for very difficult and unusual problems was to the faculty committee. Considering the number of students involved, very few difficulties were encountered during this central phase of the project. The only change in project design that occurred, however, came at this point, when upper-class supervisors were shifted to interviewing, and the lines of communication between interviewers and the student "general staff" became direct.

When the interviewing period ended, the group had obtained over five hundred successful interviews. Each student prepared an evaluation report for the faculty committee, describing his total number of contacts (those made in cases in which he was ultimately refused, as well as those in which he was finally granted an interview). He also evaluated the project as an educational experience. He was asked, in addition, to describe and comment on the different respondents whom he had interviewed and to outline whatever hypotheses he would like to see tested on the basis of the data, giving his reasons.

During the interviewing period, project participants who had expressed a desire to code the questionnaires were trained for that operation, and a twenty-page code book prepared by the faculty committee was distributed to them. When the coding was completed, another group of students began the punching operation. The further work of processing, verifying, and analyzing the data continued into the spring semester of 1960, accompanied by the institution of a seminar in which the faculty members and the student project leaders discussed political problems and related them to the results of the project.

THIS experiment in political education achieved a number of diverse goals:

As a means of introducing students early in their college careers to methods of social-science research, the project was a notable success. The fear that undergraduates would not be able to master the techniques of empirical study proved groundless. Students learned at the minimum about (a) the problems of constructing a questionnaire, (b) the mechanics of interviewing, and (c) the recording and analyzing of data.

The students had an opportunity for training in IBM card-punching, card-sorting, and the operation of the desk calculator. In addition, they learned to identify empirical indicators for the theoretical conceptions with which they had become familiar in the classroom. The upper-class students had an excellent opportunity to deal with problems of supervision, control, follow-up, and other administrative duties. The problems of planning, work distribution, and work control were real-life study opportunities for those students who were enrolled in the Department's public-administration course.

In the sphere of human relations, the project was outstandingly successful. An unprecedented degree of student enthusiasm and participation was generated. Intellectual interests were discovered, and talk about the project even supplanted much of the students' normal conversation. The project became the major campus activity of a sizable group. A sense of meaningful common purpose developed, and a warm glow of mutual accomplishment pervaded the sometimes cold atmosphere of a large, urban, commuting college.

The rapport and additional communication that opened up between students and faculty members constituted another valuable development, highly prized by the students and beneficial to both sides of the exchange. During the second phase of the project, this faculty-student contact was carried further by the institution of the weekly seminar in which the faculty directors and the student staff discussed the relationship of the project to general principles of government and politics.

The opportunity to make personal contact with people of diverse backgrounds and personalities was considered by many students to be the most valuable aspect of the project. White students interviewed Negroes, Catholics interviewed Protestants, students from low-income families met corporate executives. One student, for example, said this was his first opportunity to talk with people other than "middle-class Jewish Democrats." The response of the community outside the college was, on the whole, warm and enthusiastic; and though there were a number of rebuffs, there was an increase in good will between the college and the community.

Finally, the experiment was successful in achieving its major purposes—to increase the students' understanding of the political process and to stimulate their interest in public affairs. The participants had an opportunity to get answers to many questions directly from political

activists, and by comparing notes with their colleagues they were able to arrive at some fairly realistic political truths. The questionnaire included items related to background and personality, type and intensity of party activity, variety of party duties, motivation, influence, opinion, and level of knowledge. All told, the student was exposed to a mine of new information.

In the classroom, the intellectual value of this was soon apparent, as the students' level of sophistication increased appreciably. For example, at the point where political party organization was discussed and the primary election of the party committeemen in New York explained, the students were quick to protest; they knew that many committeemen never run in a primary election. The delicate machinery of appointive posts and the importance of patronage in maintaining a party leader's power were more vividly discussed than ever before. The revelation that some committeemen were mere "ringers," who were not even aware of their status, came across more clearly than in previous classes. Many interesting hypotheses concerning the relationship between level of information and insurgency were discussed by students in the local-government and political-party courses. The relationship between sociological, psychological, and political studies was brought into clearer focus.

A number of students also decided to utilize the data collected for their course work. The graduate-student director has taken as the subject of her Master's thesis the role of the lawyer in party politics. Other students are preparing short studies dealing with ethnic-group politics, the citizens' satisfaction with the community, role-playing in a political club, the correlation between degrees of intensity in religious and political beliefs, the character of reform politicians, and analyses of interviewing methods. In addition, several participants in the project have led in the establishment on campus of student groups supporting each of the presidential aspirants, and others have decided to form a permanent club to discuss political issues. Still other participants have indicated that they intend to maintain the contacts which they made with the local party organizations. A heartening number of students have expressed interest in pursuing graduate work in political science and in entering the teaching profession. In sum, most of the students in the project developed a degree of sophistication, a store of information, and an attitude of concern about government and politics beyond expectation.

The faculty members engaged in the project were unanimous in feeling that they had profited from additional student contact, that their classroom teaching was enhanced, and that their research activities were advanced by the collection of project data. As a result of their experience with the project, they are preparing a joint study of the membership of the three New York County political parties. They also learned a few technical lessons which will be heeded in future projects of this type. First, the use of supervisors proved to be an obstruction rather

than a connection between the directing staff and the interviewing line; the channels of communication with the students must be kept as short as possible. Second, the number of students participating must be limited to those with whom the faculty can communicate directly so that the project experience can be incorporated fully into the larger framework of the course. Third, the interviewing instrument itself must be limited in its scope so that the student can easily digest the information elicited; and it must be limited in length so that interviewing does not become an imposition on either the student's or the respondent's time. The basic concept and design of the project, however, were eminently satisfactory. Everything that was done proved simple enough to be understood by all the students, yet substantial enough to be meaningful to them. Plans have been made to continue using this type of program at Hunter College for selected introductory-course students, and it could easily be adapted for use at most colleges.

The ultimate objective of this experiment was to meet a peculiar requirement of American society: that all its members be prepared to act as responsible citizens. It is difficult to determine how fully this objective has been realized, but there can be little question that a genuine spark of interest in government and politics has been kindled for a larger number of students than before.

The Full, Bright Experience

An End to Innocents Abroad

By Jesse Bier

WHAT the average American professor lecturing in France under our official exchange program looks forward to is a kind of professional uplift. What he gets—and it ought to be in the vernacular, too—is a species of downdrag, though not without its own profit. The most surprising disabusement is that his sojourn abroad has not taken him as far as he had anticipated, and wanted to go. He has not taken a smooth horizontal voyage, but rather a series of quick vertical rides within a kind of shaft, for one rides these days on the elevator of Western instruction.[1] This figure may be apt in suggesting not only that the Atlantic community shares an enclosed structure of education but also that one can still ride somewhere, after all, and not simply stand still. There is profit as well as disconcertion in the yearlong motion, though one never knows beforehand on exactly what floor the doors will open next.

Revealing differences between French and American educational systems continue to exist. They still have the force to strike the visiting American educator as he comes into mundane but vital contact with faculty and classroom life. He cannot help seeing, for instance, how much less professors in France have to do in class than we, how much more available time they have for outside work. They do not steal such time; they have it in the nature of their profession, as in the field of literature they have the available time for contemporary criticism and historical scholarship. The situation is somewhat theoretical for those members of the faculty who, restive under financial pressure, teach extra courses or do hackwork, or both, to make more money. But the official work schedule of the majority is anywhere from one-fourth to one-half as heavy as that of the Americans, during a teaching year that starts in November and ends in mid-May. They are simply not worked as hard as we, and can get on with their own research and varied projects, the implicit demand for publication being given a genuine basis for performance.

Although modifications are taking place, two other factors in the practical professional life in France make it different from ours. The first is that a professor still wields great power over students, especially

[1]The very title of the article which appeared in the March, 1958, issue of the *Educational Forum*, "Some Problems Facing University Education in the West," by the British educator William Roy Niblett, indicates our common house.

Jesse Bier *is an associate professor of English at Montana State University.*

since they know he will probably be sitting on their examining board. Thus it behooves them to do extra work for their mentor during the year if he so directs: writing papers, giving reports, attending meetings—even of grateful visiting American lecturers—or whatever he requests. In consequence, the professor in France is seated, not in a simple desk chair, but on an academic throne, still somewhat above the flood of rising democratic waters. Since students have little or no recourse from his rulings, his prestige and personal power continue to be enormous, far greater than those his American counterpart has known or, perhaps, would care to exercise. The second factor which differentiates the French professor from the American concerns teaching methods. The French educator uses painstaking, thorough, and intensive procedures—especially for *aggrégé*, or graduate, classes—to such an extent that there is generally no extemporaneous quality anywhere in his method, often not even in his humor. Everything is prepared; all details are carefully calculated.

There are clear differences, too, of course, between French and American students. It is true, according to a longstanding image, that entering French university students are of higher caliber than our Freshmen, although they no longer display the superiority some claim for them. The able ones are on the level of our good Juniors or brighter Sophomores. However, one must remember that since they graduate from secondary school later than American students do, they enjoy the advantage of greater maturity. Like their professors, they also have the advantage of a reduced schedule or work-load, in contradiction of the American image of the hard-pressed French university student who lives in a garret—an image largely created by late nineteenth-century novels, and probably only sporadically true then as now. I estimate that an average American liberal-arts student, with a twelve-to-fifteen-hour schedule, works approximately a thirty-hour week in and out of class. For the average undergraduate at a *Faculté des Lettres*, a thirty-hour week would be a maximum allotment, his average expenditure of time for any given normal week ranging more nearly from twelve to eighteen hours, in and out of class or the *bibliothèque* or the café.

In terms of the quality or kind of classroom work the French students pursue by preference, there are certain psychological distinctions which follow naturally from the methods with which their professors are comfortable. They want introductory plans to precede any series of lectures, and a strictly logical pattern thereafter. Americans, on the other hand, generally want, not surprises, but rather, I should say, unfoldment. Certainly, too, the famous *explication de texte* continues to be a standard difference from American classroom procedure and student preference. The French pupil is quite at home with the age-old prescriptive technique of recitation or report: the well-planned and intensive discourse of twenty to thirty minutes' duration, running to either a two-part, or the more usual and symmetrical three-part, structure. Perhaps these psychological or procedural inclinations are matters of comparative "set," but they are distinctions nonetheless, and, I believe, revealing.

THE similarities in the French and American systems of higher education, however, seem just as numerous as the distinctions. Moreover, a lengthening perspective makes them appear more striking than the differences—indeed basic. They are apparent in the character of the personnel recruited for university teaching; they are manifested in the condition and—I want to say—mood of work; they can be measured in the present organization of curriculums and especially in the preparation and status of the entering student; and they can be noted in the financial problems pervading the whole system.

The young *assistant*, like most of our own graduate students in any of the humanities, leads a triple life. When not teaching part time in a *lycée*, he meets one or two sections of first-year university classes, simultaneously taking advanced work himself, and probably doing research or writing his thesis. The long, hard pull for the initiates is as common in France as in the United States, and generally as unkind. They undergo the same sort of experience anywhere in the world, probably in any profession; and perhaps I lose the specific force of my comparison by citing an example at the bottom of the ladder. But whatever concessions may be indulged here are more than made up for at the next and most significant rung of all, I believe: the young professorial *arrivistes*. They are chairless, of course, and their mobility between universities, and their insecurities and ambitions, make them blood brothers to many Americans. In the nature of their situation, they closely resemble a host of instructors and assistant professors in the United States who have not yet been given tenure. Many of them also exhibit traits of the business psychology which has infiltrated university halls. I am referring to the misplaced junior-executive drive, which is as marked in France among this key generation of young, restless professors as it is in America, particularly since the Second World War. They take advantage of every occasion to increase their prestige at regional or national conferences, they are striving for "dynamic" teaching, they are compulsively writing for publication, they are spurring themselves on to move to Paris[2] one day, they are thrusting for position in a sometimes covert but frenetic attempt that shows how much the business ethos has violated academe on both sides of the Atlantic.[3] They are not yet the old guard in France, but they may get there.

One also sees similarities he would have preferred not to in curricular practice. He might have wanted, for example, to see the free elective system in full and unhampered operation. But he discovers that although the students are nominally practicing such a system, they are constantly being "advised" into certain courses. Because of the personal factor involved and the power of the professors and chairmen, such

[2]We have, of course, no single capital or center comparable to Paris and its university; the nearest approach to it would be a complex of something like the Ivy League Three and Columbia, with adjuncts like Swarthmore and Reed added for extra Sorbonic tone. The pull of such a magnet is understandably strong.

[3]The choice of title for the recent investigation of American university life, *The Academic Marketplace*, speaks eloquently to the point.

advice amounts to a requirement. It is widely proclaimed that all that students are required to do is pass their terminal examinations, but the system of supervision works to put pressure on them in many ways. They have to attend this class or that, and such-and-such a conference (for a kind of attendance is taken); they must hand in whatever reports are unofficially deemed necessary (so that, sometimes, a professor may know that the examinee who has been his student is not really so weak here or there as the examination may indicate); they are expected to be acquainted with carefully prescribed critical views. The result can be tantamount to a very close regularization, and a faculty at this or that provincial center can play watchdog with even more fidelity at times than Americans do. At any rate, "restrictive" and "free" are not really distinguishing terms—at least, not any more—for our respective national practices in these matters.

All the while, the sheer number of students in *Lettres*, as elsewhere, increases—the basic Western pattern. With this increase in numbers, there is an increase of students less well qualified than before, less deserving of advanced education and degrees, for they have come from steadily deteriorating secondary schools (again as in America). And like the States, France in particular is experiencing an untoward teaching-training cycle, absorbing in higher education more and more students of sub-standard background and returning a sizable portion of them, less extensively trained than they would have been a generation ago, to the *lycées*, where they in turn prepare new batches of students less well instructed than before. The whole situation is similar to America's decades-old problem, and, up to the point where we have recently tried to retrench, our solutions overlap. In America we have instituted "lower divisions," as at the University of Colorado, and have designed junior colleges expressly to bridge the distance between secondary schooling and college education proper. That is what is happening in French higher education, too. For over five years now, the propaedeutic lower-division, or junior-college, year has been installed in the system of liberal-arts education. This period of grace is clearly meant to help the student make up work he has missed in the declining *lycées*,[4] and to introduce him to university life more gradually than is traditional. He is made acquainted formally with the new intellectual resources at his disposal, with the new demands to be placed on him, with testing procedures and vocational literature to crystallize personal plans that used to be much clearer, and, in special classes, with literary and historical information he was formerly obliged to learn and retain in secondary school. As such, the propaedeutic represents both a certain human advance in the educational process and a commentary on what has been lost. In the latter sense, especially, it is a striking phenomenon in the course of French educational theory and practice, a revealing concession to rising problems America has long faced alone.

[4]The *baccalauréat*, or high-school diploma, which is also a matriculation certificate for the university, is more easily come by than before.

Whereas we are already tending to discourage continued work for youths of no higher than junior-college capabilities—in some states, for example California and New York, a terminal degree or certificate inferior to the A.B. is granted[6]—the French have not yet reached that point of counteraction. They are in great need of schoolteachers, whose training must not be discouraged. They are uneasy at contributing to an accelerated deterioration of their system from the ground up, but they have not yet fully felt the constricting coils of the dilemma as we have begun to feel them. Perhaps French authorities believe they are penalizing their average students enough by barring them from scholarships and the accelerated program for the *Licence*. At all events, the leveling problem is creating new questions of university organization and is complicating curriculums as it is in America.

Add to this the astronomical rise in the costs of education in France, especially of new physical plant. This resemblance to the situation in America comes as no surprise, of course, and is perhaps extrinsic to a discussion of principally internal questions of higher education. I mention it, however, not only to re-enforce the case for similarity, but to point up a common cultural imbalance of which the financial situation is a symptom. For the crisis of available funds reflects a Western scale of narrowly materialistic values. We have overliteralized democratic education and undervalued it so much and so long that it has been critically weakened on both sides of the ocean.

MOST of the differences between the French and American educational systems which I have previously explored in this paper constitute superiorities redounding to the credit of the French. Their instructional staffs are not overworked, like ours; and, considering the long training behind doctors of letters, this tradition seems to me to be as much a reasonable consequence of justice as it is an index of status, and the whole French approach to be purer than ours. This superiority contributes its full share to whatever remains impressive and healthy in the work of the French professors. As for the students, let me hasten to acknowledge that my French students of American literature were, after all, working in a foreign language, whereas most of our Sophomores and Juniors—and Seniors, too—are inadequate, at best, in other tongues. In addition, the average French student's analytical abilities are certainly higher than those of Americans, at any stage of undergraduate and even graduate work, a virtue probably stemming from the constant exercises, like the *explication de texte*, which inculcate a drive for concentration and clarity, and are, at their best, articulate, carefully organized, and close-in performances.

There are, however, as many shortcomings as virtues in French education, and they gather that doubled force to themselves which I have attributed to the sheer surprise of their discovery. A number of them are of special interest to Americans.

[6]This degree is generally designated the "Associate in Arts."

Among the faculty, for instance, open or advertised intellectual "conflicts" are frowned upon. Well, being in conflict is like being pregnant—you either are or you aren't. So that what is really meant is a tacit but powerful disapproval of conflicts as such. The thing to do in research, if one has an overly independent mind, is to choose an area where others have not worked; in academic courses, one more or less follows adopted views and keeps to himself whatever unconventional viewpoint he may have. This circumscription is passed on to students, who are quick to note that there is a "line" to be taken in this or that study. The whole matter is one of good form. There is an outlined program to be followed in all university centers from Paris to Lyons to Marseilles—prescribed contents and advisable procedures. And there are pains taken on any given faculty, if not to agree perfectly on general or specific approaches, then not to disagree either; one can break the code—and a very few try, though the attempt in the nature of things proves violent and unseemly—but one is regarded as unethical and, worse for the French, foolish if he does.

Another fact is surprising. Not enough solid work materializes from the extra time professors have—the older ones, especially—for scholarship or criticism or whatnot. Not that they have to prove anything—Americans have to prove too much, too often, too quantitatively—but they simply do not write enough outstanding books or articles to justify themselves, the proportion of such work, although always relatively small, being markedly higher in the United States. There is a lack of outlet, of course; there are not quite enough university presses[6] or accessible journals. But this explanation does not go far enough. Notable exceptions aside,[7] the meager output of scholarly writing counts on some page of the ledger one compiles, however impressionistic the accounting.

Neither is there enough work steadily demanded of French students! I have already adverted to their work-load, only about half that of the American student. Moreover, one cannot rely on their adherence to even the light schedule they carry, especially in the matter of basic and collateral reading. French students of literature do not generally keep up with the parallel reading of the course they are following, if indeed they read at all. Their goal is to pass the terminal examinations, and they trust that their notes will see them through most of the material. They submit to the specifically assigned paper or topic for *explication*—which is a way of getting them to work—but they will not read assignments in full, or at all, if they can help it. They regard their university career as a challenging problem of shifting strategy, of finesse. Meanwhile, a lecturer may find himself talking in a kind of vacuumized amphi-

[6]This situation also hampers the publication of low-cost translations for students of the works of many standard American and British authors: there is really no acceptable economical edition of even Poe, for example; and no edition of Yeats is available at all.

[7]I am thinking of two in the field of American letters, for example: either Jean Catel's long work, his scrupulous and extended analyses of Whitman's creative process, or articles by Roger Asselineau, like his typically incisive study of Sherwood Anderson's expressionism or surrealism.

theater, speaking about questions of theme and structure, character and incident, with which a great portion of his audience is not at all acquainted. The experience is frequently one of the blandest unreality.

For once, the American system of periodic tests has some justification by contrast. Quizzes and mid-term examinations in American colleges generally catch up these course tacticians and strain the sluggards. Perhaps it is six of one and half a dozen of the other, but the American lecturer often finds more artificiality and suffers greater frustration in the French procedure. A student for the *Licence* or Master's degree in American literature at the University of Paris is allowed, even directed, to submit toward his examination a paper which is written in French and based on a French translation; and often he has not read that translation entirely, depending on his magical notes and his stylistic talent instead. Such a system often fails to establish contacts. It is common knowledge that students who are clever, or merely articulate, can complete a curriculum in literature without anything like an adequate first-hand familiarity with the subject-matter.

The heart of the question, already obliquely referred to, lies in the European overemphasis on terminal examinations and on articulateness. In the examinations themselves, the Continental stress is upon technique, organizational and stylistic; upon expression as such, not content. This approach extends to graduate papers and dissertations, whereas our American demands err on the opposite side. As a matter of fact, the emphasis on technique indicts even the famous *explication de texte* at its weakest, for the necessity of meeting its artificial requirement of three points covered or thirty minutes consumed leads to overdrawn interpretation. Such disequilibrium is not inevitable or even usual in French universities, but it does occur. We may sacrifice balance, too, but our weighting of content rather than technique seems saner to us.[8] At worst, so far as his preparation for writing certain reports, papers, and examinations is concerned, the French student might just as well have attended evening classes in rhetoric and gone to penmanship school. I exaggerate to emphasize the fact that, if there must be a lack of balance, the stress ought to be 60–40 for content, not 70–30 for style.

Perhaps I am not so much indicting the French here as I am revealing an American inclination to stress not only content but statistics. And that is a nice question, as it is also an opportune one, with which to conclude the most ungenerous section of this paper. For having exposed the defects of the French educational system, I might just as well turn an eye inward to reappraise native shortcomings—especially our tendency to dichotomize and enumerate. And that is scarcely the least service a Fulbright experience can contribute.

[8]This is a strange but genuine paradox, for Americans are otherwise enamored of mechanical technique. In higher education, the contrast between France and America is predominantly one between humanistic articulateness and science-oriented information. This may be the same as saying that either the French preserve their aesthetic spirit in their research and scholarship or they misplace it there. Or that my suggestion betrays itself as purely American and arbitrary.

I HAVE been told that the best of the French faculty and student body are not in the universities at all, but in the *Ecoles*, those scarce and almost secret institutes of highly specialized advanced training. Others believe that the *Ecoles* are too rarefied and atypical to be representative of French higher education. My inability to sort out the truth from conflicting opinions reflects a certain confusion or schizophrenia not peculiar, it seems, to American education. It is a moot question, this problem of the "best," and ultimately irrelevant to a report comparing the average French university with ours. All in all, I have found more striking similarities than differences in the two systems of higher education, with enough French shortcomings to match their superiorities. I should have wished to see a wider social breadth of student background, more students coming from ranks below the bourgeoisie,[9] to equal our own continuing spread—in fact, there is an accelerated movement in this direction in France, accentuating problems of intellectual "leveling." But in most ways I never left home—or, to keep the figure straight, my home office. My elevator door simply opened upon other floors in the same building. Although that is not exactly the communiqué the gentlemen in the back room on my floor have waited to receive, still it is news.

It is not the final news, however. The last thing any correspondent would dare contend is that all the returns are in, all the modern lessons for educators taught, all the directions explored. One tries to be clear today, but he had best be tentative at a stage of cultural and technological history where today becomes tomorrow so quickly. Even as Old Europe becomes new, indeed transformed, she may instruct us next Tuesday in ways unglimpsed now, just as we, in America, may continue to hit upon fructifying experiments and necessary compromises available to all. Only that is decisive news: our international common ground.

What I have seen suggests, in the end, that the very good students in either America or France are hard to confuse, and enjoyable to teach, in any system. With the very good professors on both sides of the water, they are still rising above educational systems, free and hospitable members now of one edifice or community. That is the realization we need to reach, and our exchange programs at this time are performing a first-class service in helping us to do so. For many visiting American lecturers and observers, like myself, such is the liberating end to their innocence abroad. It involves the incorporation of what Lionel Trilling has called "the other culture" into their own, and an insight into the true inclusiveness of their Western home.

[9]Comparative enrollment figures for respective populations show that there is about one university student for every seventy people in the United States, whereas the proportion in France runs something like one university student for every two hundred people. From my observations, I should say that the missing student in France is the lower-class youth with too many obstacles put in his way and with even less scholarship and fewer part-time employment opportunities presented him by the schools and the general economy than he has in America.

What Price Professors?

Why Faculty Salaries Are Low

By JAHANGIR AMUZEGAR

IN THE post-Sputnik clamor over the deficiencies of higher education in the United States, the economic plight of the university professor has been so convincingly dramatized that it is now almost disloyal for him not to feel sorry for his colleagues, and overtly snobbish of him not to engage in self-pity. Yet amidst the many self-righteous tears that are being shed over this *cause célèbre*, the nature of the problem is often misunderstood, its real causes lost sight of, and its alternative solutions seldom clearly distinguished and evaluated.

The plight of the university professor, in the words of an articulate victim, is a socio-economic one.[1] Economically, his income is low: he earns less than the bartender, the paper hanger, and the city garbage collector. Socially, he is obscure and inconsequential: because of his paltry income, a money-minded society gives him a lowly social status.

Since this paper is concerned with the economic plight of the professor, the matter of social status can safely be put aside. Inasmuch as the latter is determined largely by size of income, the problem is chiefly economic and can be treated as such.[2] But before examining the reasons for low pay and the possibility of raising it, two points must be made explicit.

First, it should be noted that the popularly accepted symbol of professorial poverty is no more than a simple statistical average which in many respects distorts the true picture. It is well known that the normal university salary covers only the thirty-two-week academic year and less than the regular work week. Equally familiar is the knowledge that the average academic salary does not include the many fringe benefits provided by the college. What is not so clearly appreciated, however, is that by almost no standard (for example, type of institution, quality of instruction, degree of professional competence, or extent of alternative opportunities) can a college professor be said to belong to an identifiable competing group whose "average income" could be mean-

[1] R. B. Hovey, "The Inarticulate Professor," *Saturday Review*, XLII (April 18, 1959), pp. 16–17.

[2] It should, however, be noted in passing that these two phenomena are neither logically nor universally correlated. In Western Europe, parts of Asia, and Latin America, college professors enjoy a high measure of social prestige and wield a considerable degree of political power although their university income is lower than that of their intellectual inferiors. Seymour M. Lipset shows that even in the United States, this relationship is not quite so obvious. See "American Intellectuals: Their Politics and Status," *Daedalus*, LXXXVIII (Summer, 1959), pp. 460–98.

JAHANGIR AMUZEGAR *is an associate professor of economics at Occidental College.*

ingfully compared with other average incomes. Doctors, dentists, and lawyers belong to reasonably homogeneous groups, although their intra-group incomes may vary widely. Professors, however, are part of no such unified group; on the contrary, they represent substantially heterogeneous groups: physicists, mathematicians, writers, economists, and teachers of physical education and square-dancing may all be housed in the same campus building and given the same title, but a substantial stretch of the imagination would be needed to bind them together in a single professional category.

College professors range from Nobel Prize–winners whose scientific, artistic, and intellectual achievements are reshaping human destiny, to occasional social failures whose knowledge and ability hardly measure up to those of their students. Among the many thousands who bear the title of professor, a large number, by virtue of their advantageous bargaining position, manage to exact substantial salaries from their universities. Many more earn extra incomes from writing, lecturing, consultation, or practice large enough to rank them with top-salaried people anywhere in the economy.[3] And there are, of course, a large number whose outside opportunities are so limited that their next-best alternative is often no better than to teach their subject-matter in the junior college or the high school. These less fortunate individuals are naturally the lowest-paid members of the academic fraternity. The average salary of such economically divergent groups is, to repeat, not economically meaningful. The much-lamented economic predicament of the professor, therefore, refers to the relatively low average academic salary of those professors who have little or no outside opportunity to earn extra income, and in whose scale of preference their intangible (psychic) incomes do not replace hard cash.

But the mere fact that college professors do not enjoy as high a level of living as some other fortunate groups is in itself neither a reason for economic grievance nor an argument for a pay raise. From an economic standpoint, a salary increase may be justifiably demanded on the basis of a rise in productivity. But this is evidently not the basis on which professors think they are entitled to higher pay. Nor could they invoke the productivity argument if they wanted to, because there is no yardstick which can measure and show such an increase. The non-economic rationale for improving college salaries is thus the second important point to have clearly in mind.

The argument for higher university salaries must, of necessity, be sought in the realms of politics and ethics. On social and moral grounds, it might be deemed desirable to reward university professors, not according

[3]The average figure almost always refers to the academic salaries only. Even on the basis of the strictly academic salaries, the difference between various ranks in the same university and the gap between the same ranks at different institutions are remarkably high. In 1958–59, the minimum mean salary of an instructor in a private university was $4,250; the maximum mean salary of a full professor, $15,150. A full professor at a two-year Southern college may receive as little as $2,950, whereas the maximum salary of a professor in a famous graduate school (usually undisclosed) runs upward of $20,000. See W. R. Bokelman, *Higher Education Planning and Management Data, 1958–59* (Circular No. 549; Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1959), pp. 31–35.

to their monetary worth, but, instead, in terms of their contribution to the society's intellectual, artistic, or spiritual progress. In the interests of national political welfare, too, it might be rational to raise faculty salaries to such higher levels as may be necessary to attract and retain first-rate intellectual, scientific, or creative talents in the academic circles. In either case, needless to say, consumer's sovereignty would have to be rejected in favor of morally desirable social goals.

Assuming that theoretical and practical problems of establishing such criteria can be solved,[4] the question would be how to increase faculty salaries. Finding an effective remedy for academic ills, like discovering the cure for any other malady, requires a correct diagnosis of the underlying causes. Deploring the fact that university professors are economically worse off than bartenders or paper hangers is an emotional argument which, although sincerely intended and perhaps genuinely moving, confuses the issue and hampers the search for the real causes of the problem.

WHO is to blame for the professor's predicament? In popular discussions, fingers of accusation often hesitatingly point at the non-academic interests of the trustees, the overzealousness of the administrators, the political conservatism of the legislators, and the anti-intellectual values of the bourgeois society itself. These charges are not only vague and overly sentimental, they really miss the point of the matter. Curiously enough, many of those who use economic measurements in describing and deploring the dilemma of the college professor seldom ask themselves why the university professor's pay is less than than that of the bartender or the garbage collector. If they did, they would be bound to find their answer in the simple economic fact that those who seek higher education are fairly lucky: they are not required to pay much for it. But those who cry their hearts out in a bar corner, have paper hung on their bourgeois walls, or have their garbage removed are not so lucky: they have to pay dearly.

Whether or not one wishes to subject teachers' salaries to the vulgarities of the market place, the fact remains that in a basically consumer-directed economy like that of the United States, incomes from college teaching are determined by the same inexorable forces that determine incomes for other occupations—garbage collectors, brassière advertisers, rock-and-roll singers, *et al.* As every bright Sophomore knows, the income of any productive group in a market economy is the price paid for the services of the group, and as such is regulated by supply and demand. Income differentials, corresponding to people's demand for each other's work, are dictated by a multitude of forces that are in their totality blind and impersonal.

To the extent that consumers' choice is allowed to determine market

[4]The difficulty in establishing such a rationale, of course, lies in the very formulation of some defensible social criteria and their application to individual cases. General agreement would be needed, not only on the hierarchy of human values, but also on the particular techniques of measuring individual achievements. And neither on the priority of values nor on the methods of evaluation can a consensus be found among reasonable men—least of all among professors themselves.

prices and faculty incomes, the demand for faculty services naturally tends to reflect the consumers' demand (that is, willingness to pay) for higher education. And so long as consumers are not ready to pay as much for a university lecture as they pay for a ball game or a prize fight, faculty incomes will obviously lag behind the incomes of ballplayers and prize fighters. This is what consumer sovereignty entails. The deficiency of consumer demand is, of course, generally made up by philanthropic endowments, business grants, and government subsidies; but these outside sources do not supply enough money to bring faculty salaries to the morally or socially desirable levels.

In spite of the consumers' obvious aversion to paying for their college education and the inadequacy of non-tuition incomes, however, the responsibility for the plight of the college professor cannot be placed wholly on lack of demand. In the last two decades the steady increase in college enrollment has been an infallible reflection of rising demand. Along with the doubling of the student body during this period, the funds available to pay faculty salaries have likewise advanced. Federal, state, and local appropriations have increased. Tuition fees on the average have almost doubled. And private support of higher education has shown an unprecedented jump.

In the face of such a sustained rise in demand, one would normally expect faculty salaries to go up correspondingly, if not comparatively faster. Yet throughout most of this period faculty pay has not risen even modestly. Between 1939 and 1949, college enrollments rose from 1,494,000 (14 per cent of the population of college age) to 2,659,000 (27 per cent of that same population)—an increase of almost 80 per cent. In the same period, however, college salaries increased by a mere 32.3 per cent, or less than the average for six other professional or technical occupations (including the ministry).[5] Even with noticeable salary increases between 1949 and 1954, the percentage rise in average faculty pay barely exceeded the percentage increase in enrollment.[6] But, again, in terms of purchasing power in 1954, faculty members were actually 24 per cent worse off than they had been fourteen years earlier.[7]

The unavoidable conclusion is that in the last two decades the increased demand for college teachers has been amply matched by the supply. In fact, the increase in supply has been so nearly equal to the increased demand as to make the student-faculty ratio hover faithfully around 10 to 1. Thus, at the risk of overemphasizing one cause of the problem at the expense of others, one cannot help putting the major blame for faculty woes on oversupply. The economic plight of the college professor is to a large extent self-imposed: whatever has befallen

[5]See Herman P. Miller, *Income of the American People* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1955), Appendix C, Tables C–2 (pp. 178–82) and C–4 (pp. 188–92).

[6]For the bases of comparison, see H. G. Badger *et al.*, *Statistics of Higher Education: Faculty, Students, and Degrees, 1955–56* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1958), p. 43; see also the Council for Financial Aid to Education, *Reference Book: Corporation Aid to American Higher Education* (New York: The Council, 1955), p. ii.

[7]See E. M. DeCicco, "Faculty Salaries and Inflation," *Collegiate News and Views*, XI (December, 1957), pp. 5–9.

him seems to be partly the result of his own behavior. It goes without saying that in the absence of such increases in faculty supply, the upward movement of the demand would have been sufficient to raise faculty salaries much closer to the desired levels.

This is not the place to analyze the many tangible and intangible factors behind the lure of college teaching and the availability of candidates too anxious to serve at low salaries. Most of the advantages are well publicized and quite obvious: relative freedom of action, opportunities for independent study and research, security, plenty of leisure time for travel, writing, and so on, and many more. Whether or not such "psychic incomes" are illusory, exaggerated, or unworthy of the professor's fancy is beside the point. The question to be answered is why so many intelligent people seek positions that are economically unremunerative and socially mediocre.

IF THE causes of the professor's low pay lie in the deficiency of demand and the plenitude of supply, the cure must be sought in an increase in demand or a reduction of supply or both. The demand for college education, and thus for college professors, is a function of student tuition fees, private aid, and public subsidies. An increase in the size of any of these variables *ceteris paribus* would favorably affect faculty salaries. The most obvious method of increasing faculty salaries, of course, is to raise tuition (at the risk, however, of a drop in enrollments). Like most such simple solutions, however, this policy is opposed by many pressure groups and has little chance of nation-wide support.

The other largely untapped resources that can help finance a faculty pay increase are private endowments, particularly corporate donations. These resources, however, are not inexhaustible. Although their limits are by no means yet in sight, private contributions cannot be expected to finance a substantial across-the-board raise in faculty salaries. Moreover, corporate wealth and individual fortunes cannot be increasingly tapped without running the risk of further exposing the independence and integrity of the university to the whims of the community. In Robert Hutchins' view, the university today has already passed the danger point of having to "flatter the community" in order to survive. Prosperity might put the college completely at the mercy of its benefactors.

The only remaining alternatives would be an increase in government aid to higher education or the regulation of the supply of college teachers. This is a choice which the college professor hopes he will never have to make. The gravity of his economic situation does not lie in any real impasse since either of these alternatives would work reasonably well. The difficulty is that neither of them is entirely acceptable to him, and there seems to be no other solution.

More difficult, perhaps, than the task of pressuring Congress and the American people to foot a larger educational bill is that of overcoming the professor's reluctance to accept extensive federal aid for fear of subjecting academic freedom and professional independence to regimentation by

the government. Underlying this familiar apprehension is the threat of being forced to allow a misinformed majority or a self-interested minority to set not only salary standards but standards for teaching, research, and extra-curricular activities. Although the danger of this may not seem formidable to some individual faculty members in state universities, it is bound to alarm many teachers in private and denominational institutions.

The cold and somewhat bitter reactions expressed toward the Ruml *Memo*[8] appear to indicate that faculties are not yet willing to relinquish any of their privileges in order to receive higher monetary rewards. Should they, and the self-appointed guardians of their freedom and independence, be willing to accept encroachments on their prerogatives, the money required to finance pay raises would not be hard to find.

IF THE professor's qualms about infringement upon his academic freedom were removed, and sufficient sentiment were found in favor of a larger government subsidy for higher education, the problem would be financially soluble. But a substantial improvement in the college professor's lot would then depend on whether or not other factors remained constant. This is the major complicating circumstance.

Thus far, there has been little effective substitution for the classroom teacher. As a result, the demand for faculty has shown a close correlation with the size of the college enrollment. Under the pressure of rising faculty pay, college administrators would undoubtedly try to introduce mechanical methods of instruction on a growing scale: lecture halls would become larger; the professor's voice would be carried through loudspeakers; laboratory work would be taught mainly by motion pictures; and more "fringe" courses would be eliminated or offered on television and by correspondence. These and similar technological innovations would, of course, weaken the professor's position.

The threat to auspicious prospects for college teaching goes beyond this. There is every likelihood that once university professors began to improve their position vis-à-vis their field-mates in industry or government, two countermovements would soon get under way. In the short run, there would be a tendency among industrial scientists and government experts to return to university life. It is interesting to note that since 1953, in a period when faculty salaries have shown a decidedly upward movement,[9] the number of new college teachers coming from non-teaching fields has increased from a little over 26 per cent of total new employment to about 31 per cent in 1956–57, and to 37.5 per cent in 1958–59.[10] With a relatively faster increase in faculty salaries, the lure of college teaching might once again become difficult to resist. Any back-to-college movement would eventually weaken the faculty's bargaining position.

[8]Beardsley Ruml and Donald H. Morrison, *Memo to a College Trustee: A Report on Financial and Structural Problems of the Liberal College* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959).

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 2.

[10]National Education Association, Research Division, *Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1957–58 and 1958–59* (Research Report, 1959–R 10; Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1959), pp. 16–18.

Nor is this the extent of the danger. The biggest threat yet to the fulfillment of faculty hopes for higher pay may come from the potential supply of inferior substitutes. The fate of the rising salaries would seem to depend on the extent to which the quality of college education itself was diluted under the pressure of rising costs and mounting equalitarian demands for a readily attainable university diploma. Low-quality education would, in turn, drive high-quality professors out of the market and would keep college salaries from rising. Since the needs of an intellectually mediocre student body can be satisfied by a less competent, less well-qualified, and thus less expensive faculty, college administrators would be likely to employ the poorer substitutes. This trend is already evidenced by a disquieting report on the educational preparation of newly employed teachers. In the school years 1957–59 almost 6 per cent of all new full-time college faculty came directly from the preceding year's Bachelors, as compared with 3 per cent in 1955–57; and 13 per cent of all new faculty members were drawn from among high-school, and a few elementary-school, teachers.[11]

In short, any future increase in college salaries is contingent upon the assumptions that college enrollment will continue to rise at about the present rate and that the quality of higher education will not be seriously impaired. Watering down the content of a college education, like cheapening any product, offers no guarantee of a pay raise for the producers, especially if the quality is lowered with the consent or connivance of the customer himself. Unless the college professor can successfully ward off new increases in the number of teaching candidates and prevent a market flood of cheap substitutes, his hope for an improvement in his economic condition is unwarranted.

IN THE face of these unfavorable possibilities, the college professor's strongest weapon in his fight for higher salaries may be a close-knit and strongly professional association, dedicated first and foremost to the cause of his economic salvation—an association run by professional organizers who will lobby for him before the legislature, bargain collectively for him, and safeguard his freedom and independence.

It is not within the scope of this paper to determine in what form such a guild can best be organized to serve the interest of its members. A more interesting, and a far more significant, question is whether the college professor wants higher salaries badly enough to favor such an association. The question is not as superfluous as it seems. The familiar allegation that the college professor shies away from unaccustomed luxuries[12] or that scientists revolt against such symbols of conspicuous consumption as expensive homes, fine cars, and costly clothes for their wives[13] is made too frequently to go unheeded. But even if such assertions are exag-

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[12] See, for example, Helmut Schoeck, "The Envy Barrier," in *Foreign Aid Reexamined*, edited by James W. Wiggins and Helmut Schoeck (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1958), p. 96.

[13] See Bernard Barber, *Science and the Social Order* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1952), p. 107.

gerated, unrealistic, or untrue, the answer is still far from obvious. To aspire to higher levels of living is one thing; to pursue them rationally is another. The real question is whether the college professor would be willing to achieve higher economic well-being by accepting the material values of a society that he denounces as anti-intellectual and bourgeois. Would he be willing to follow the dictates of the same market forces that he often rejects as base and vulgar? Would he lower himself to act like his classroom villain—the "economic man"?

The writer does not profess to have the answers to these questions, but he finds a positive and unqualified "yes" somewhat wide of the mark. To accept the values of a car salesman, or to follow the tactics of a teamster unionist, would pull the props from under the secluded edifice which the college professor has built for his own spiritual and aesthetic gratification. In the intellectually exalted and socially secure haven where he now broods, business heroes are tiny marionettes: he can afford to laugh at them so long as he is an economic martyr. His economic martyrdom and his professed antibourgeois attitude cover up his lack of salesmanly aggressiveness; they set him apart from the rough-and-tumble of an economic race which he detests. He can go on despising money-mindedness so long as he himself spends hundreds of hours in meticulous work, writing articles for which he does not receive enough money to cover the cost of the paper. What would happen if he pursued economic objectives overtly, like a union man going after a higher hourly wage? Who would his superiors in rank be, then, but the very captains of industry and Hollywood moguls whom he has ridiculed?

Could the college professor stand such a transformation? The answer is not certain. The long-time preoccupation of the American Association of University Professors with such non-economic issues as violations of academic freedom and civil liberties, and its almost fanatical repugnance toward dealing with the question of faculty salaries, cast grave doubt on the readiness of college professors as a group to jump into the economic arena.

It will not be easy for the American college professor to escape from the dilemma in which he finds himself today. The concessions he would have to make to do so will not grow less objectionable. Whatever solution he seeks—whether it be reliance on students' evaluations, private grants, public subsidy, or unionization—will involve a painful compromise. It costs to be comfortable. Is the college professor willing to pay the price?

Short Contributions

Closed-Circuit Television as a Teaching Aid

The phrase "closed-circuit television" is a dangerous one to use in contemporary academic circles. The pro-TV faction tends to be vocal and enthusiastic; the anti-TV guild is likely to be vocal and hypercritical; the neutrals know the battle will be long and vigorous. The participants are characteristically well armed with fact, precedent—and conjecture—concerning the use of television as a substitute for the small class face to face with an instructor.

In this short paper, an attempt is made to analyze dispassionately the potentials of closed-circuit educational television as a medium of instruction which supplements the laboratory, the blackboard, the models, and the projection equipment of the conventional classroom.

Television, in essence, involves the conversion of a photographic image into an electronic signal pattern which is reconverted to a photographic image by the receiver. If the television signal cannot be received as a picture on the home receiver—that is, if the signal is carried from the transmitter to a known group of receivers only—the transmission is said to be closed circuit. A closed-circuit system may be obtained by a direct (wired) connection of the receiver to the transmitter, by broadcasting on a frequency (for example, "microwave") which cannot be tuned in by the home receiver, by a coded signal (now used by subscription TV), or by a very limited range of broadcast (perhaps twenty feet from an antenna).

Closed-circuit television (CCTV) has been used in education as a teaching aid; in industry, to monitor remote operations; in entertainment, to distribute sports or special events on a fee basis; in communication, as a "seeing eye" telephone, long-distance visual public-address system, or remote-vision intercommunication network. It has been used to permit a single event to be observed simultaneously in many different places or to allow a number of events at different places to be watched simultaneously at one observation point. It permits viewers to see through walls, crowds, and other obstructions, or to view from favorable angles or at meaningful distances. CCTV has been used to observe hazardous operations without danger to the viewer, to act as a burglar alarm or detection device, to include overflow crowds at meetings, to conduct tours for a visitor who remains in one location, and for general management–staff communication in business and industry.

Two categories of educational closed-circuit television are "total teaching" and "visual aid." In total teaching, CCTV is a means of placing the instructor in classrooms where he is not physically present during the course, or a major portion of it. Visual-aid uses involve bringing supplemental materials into the classroom where the instructor is physically present, or providing better visibility than the conventional classroom permits. Total teaching is exemplified by the addition of remote classrooms (removed from the point of program origination, although a remote point may be only a few feet away); by instruction from a studio where students are not present; by presentation of kinescoped lectures; or by a presentation at one location designed to instruct individuals located at several widely scattered points.

Visual-aid applications of CCTV include the provision of close-ups to a larger number of persons simultaneously than would otherwise be possible—and a better perspective, the integration of materials from out-of-class locations, the observation of dangerous areas without risk to the viewer, eavesdropping on situations in which the presence of a large number of observers would defeat the purpose of the observation, and the availability of a sequence of camera locations not within the normal mobility of a student group. Also, special techniques are available through CCTV which are employed to increase the range of materials available to an instructor: multiple-camera operation provides superimposed views of before-and-after graphs when the axes are proportional or equal, or juxtaposition of a dynamometer scale and a tachometer on the receiving screen, or alternate light-dark contrasts of compared objects; and it brings together widely separated areas (a professor in the classroom may point out details of composition in an oil painting hanging in a distant gallery, or a laboratory demonstration of mechanical advantage can be juxtaposed with the image of a crane in actual operation); color filters may be used to stress selected details or eliminate undesired materials; close-ups may be achieved of faraway objects (expansion joints of a bridge's supports may be viewed without climbing under the bridge); or a TV camera can be strapped under an automobile to project the action of a suspension system while the car is moving over a road. CCTV makes it possible to distribute projected materials to several classes simultaneously without relocation of the classes, and to insert projected materials into classroom procedures without the use of a special projector, screen, speaker, and blackout curtains.

In addition to the TV teacher, other personnel are necessary for educational CCTV operations. There must be one cameraman or a remote-control system for each camera chain, a director for each presentation when two or more camera chains are used on one presentation, perhaps a separate person for the projection unit and recording equipment, and engineers, commercial artists, and studio personnel as the operation increases in complexity. A minimum crew for an effective operation would probably include one cameraman (to operate projection and recording equipment and remotely controlled cameras, and to serve as maintenance

engineer) and a director (acting as control-board engineer, program manager, and faculty-TV co-ordinator in most educational institutions where TV is employed). This minimum crew would spend about half its time transmitting programs; the other half would be required for setups, rehearsals, maintenance, film-processing, and similar essential functions. Two or three crews of this size would be needed for full-time availability of TV teaching aids. The addition of more crews makes a multiple-channel transmission possible (two, three, or four different programs can be transmitted simultaneously, the one desired being selected at the receiver by tuning in the channel carrying it).

For the minimum CCTV system, a storage closet and room for a workbench for maintenance are the only added space requirements. If a projection unit is included, two small rooms (8 feet square) should be sufficient. A studio and two control rooms, including projection equipment, would call for about 1,200 square feet of floor space and a ceiling at least 12 feet in height. Complete operation of a complex TV function, including space for administrative requirements, requires 6,000 to 8,000 square feet of floor space for a completely self-contained unit capable of serving a large educational community. Such a unit is frequently referred to as a "TV teaching center."

The total cost of the minimum system of camera, signal generator, monitor, and receiver is approximately $5,000. A complete system for a moderate studio-centered CCTV facility requires an equipment investment of about $20,000. A full-scale, multiple-channel system, employing a color studio, remote pickups, microwave transmission, magnetic recording, and building, costs up to $500,000. Normally a six-year amortization period may be used as a basis for calculating annual costs. Maintenance and repair costs vary widely according to preventive maintenance practices and the age, handling, extent of use, and types of equipment employed, but should probably be estimated at an annual expenditure of 15 to 20 per cent of the original cost of the new equipment.

The use of TV as a source of materials for classroom teaching requires the same skills needed in any other form of effective instruction. In addition to these, however, some special training in the efficient use of this teaching medium is necessary. The instructor must anticipate his need for televised materials in order to plan in detail for their effective integration by the cameraman and the director. The classroom teacher must communicate his needs to the television crewmen and co-operate with them in order to produce the most useful presentation for efficient learning. Cameraman and director must be able to anticipate the movements of an instructor, the order of presentation of teaching aids, the camera angles desired, and the length of time a subject is to be held in the camera's view. The instructor must present his materials to the lens of a camera rather than to the students before him, and he must remain out of the camera's line of vision with the object or area it is picking up. He must also avoid casting shadows on the materials while they are being telecast. When the teacher is in a room apart from his students, he must

direct his attention to the camera, he must not allow himself to be distracted by the commotion of the TV crew's activities, and he must accommodate to the heat and glare of bright lights.

There is little evidence to indicate that the personality needed for effective teaching by means of television is different from that which is effective in the classroom. Poor teaching is not enhanced by the use of TV, although an alert crew may be able to improve a presentation by camera and control-room techniques which diminish classroom distractions. Moreover, some techniques of the classroom are not adaptable to television—discussion of materials, student recitation, student reports, and so on—when the origination point is outside the classroom where reception occurs.

The justification for educational CCTV most frequently advanced is that it makes possible an increase in student-teacher ratio, with consequent reduction of staff, space, and materials. This argument applies principally to total teaching by TV, and it is controversial. If CCTV is to be used to improve the learning opportunities of the students or to facilitate administrative functions, an evaluation of its usefulness must necessarily determine whether the benefits that accrue from its use justify the cost of using it. The value of abstract gains must be measured in terms of the fundamental objectives of the institution employing CCTV as they relate to learning or administrative efficiency. The final judgment rests upon observation of the availability of CCTV to members of the staff and the extent to which its unique advantages will be employed (a $50,000 CCTV system would be a costly means of enlarging a chart or diagram that could as effectively be presented by a $2 mimeograph or a $5 piece of art work). Thus the final evaluation of CCTV must be based on the answers to these questions: (1) What does this medium accomplish that can be achieved in no other satisfactory manner? (2) To what extent will the equipment be used to fulfill its unique functions? (3) Does the added accomplishment justify the added cost?

This résumé reveals many of the promises teaching by television holds forth, and some of the problems. The general applications and educational uses of CCTV suggest the tremendous potential of this new medium as a teaching and administrative aid. It demands relatively little change in space requirements and teacher aptitudes. Cost and personnel requirements may be heavy at first, but by beginning an operation with minimum equipment—perhaps reducing original costs further by purchasing used equipment or substituting "home-built" items—most educational institutions can keep expenditures within budgetary limits. If equipment "units" are planned, a more complex system can be constructed gradually without obsolescence of the basic units purchased to inaugurate in-school television. Finally, increasing use of CCTV in teaching will undoubtedly uncover new ways in which the medium can promote the learning process.

M. Scheffel Pierce, *Central Missouri State College*

Technological Aids in College Literature Courses

The increasing use of films and television in colleges provokes violent objections from many teachers of literature, objections which, I believe, arise from a sincere belief that such technological devices weaken what might be called the personal element in the teaching of literature. That is, the teacher is deeply concerned over the possibility that literature presented through the medium of machines may fail to emphasize qualities that are difficult to define but important.

Perhaps the concern stems partly from the fact that college literature is taught with a wide variety of objectives. A teacher may present literature as purely factual information, may deal with it as sociological material, may stress the techniques of communication, or, indeed, may present the subject with purposes ranging from the extremely objective to the highly subjective, depending on the particular class and his own philosophy of education.

With such a mixture of objectives, it is interesting to consider some of the implications of presenting a college literature course by purely technological methods. What might be some of the advantages and the disadvantages of organizing a course in which all lectures were given by film or television and the student had ample reading and critical material and easy access to recordings but saw his instructor only at examination time or at an infrequent conference?

The advantages of such a program appear obvious. A few faculty members could handle a large number of students. If one of the objectives of American education is to educate everyone who is capable of being educated, the technological method would be appropriate, since the size of the class would be of little consequence. Sixty students or six thousand can listen to a lecture over television. The number that can watch a film is limited only by the size of the auditorium and the number of showings.

Factual material presented by film or TV, in literature or in any other field, seems to be assimilated just as efficiently as that presented by traditional methods. Moreover, it could be presented more effectively than it is at present. The teacher who appeared on television or on film could be drawn from the top rank of his profession and could be trained to use the medium to its fullest effectiveness. Thus, the student would have the opportunity of attending a skillfully organized lecture given by an outstanding teacher, and, in addition, he would be able to hear and see much better than he could in the average large classroom.

In the final analysis, education is an individual matter. In a course of the type described, the student could work at his own best speed, reading, listening, organizing his material, and taking his examinations when he was ready for them. The student with unusual ability could move along rapidly because he would not be restricted by the lock step of the class. The slow student would learn more than he does under the present

system because he could watch a television lecture or film, or hear a recording, as many times as were required for him to master the material.

Since there is no valid way to test students for appreciation, it is difficult to judge the results of a mechanical presentation of literature. However, it would seem to the writer that if the literary material were skillfully presented, and the learning situations so structured as to provide the student with the desired aesthetic experience, his understanding and enjoyment of literature should be enhanced.

The objections to such a program also appear obvious. One of the chief criticisms of American education is that such an elaborate educational structure has been built that frequently students see only the framework of education and not education itself. At present, undue emphasis is placed upon grades, credit-hours, and so on. Since a mechanical approach would further stress ritualism in American education, the college using a technological presentation would run a real danger that its students might see all the films, view all the television programs, listen to all the recordings, and pass the examinations without ever coming to a real understanding of literature.

Any medium used to teach large groups must necessarily fail to consider individual differences. A mechanical method of teaching, especially if skillfully constructed, presents the student with selected material designed to elicit a restricted number of desired responses, the result being that these become the only acceptable ones. Instead of experiencing individual learning situations leading to increased intellectual and aesthetic growth, the student would have to master a prescribed amount of information to pass the examinations, an educational process used effectively in countries that allow no deviation from the established norm, but one that is not acceptable in a democracy.

Even though appreciation of literature cannot be adequately measured, experience indicates that student-teacher rapport is a very important contributing element, and that the most effective way to build appreciation and a sense of literary values is by the use of small classes taught by a competent, enthusiastic instructor. This important aspect of education, the benefit that comes from the close association of student and teacher, would be lost in a program in which mass-communication methods were used.

Although such a list of pros and cons might be continued at greater length, it appears, in brief, that the advantages of technological aids in college literature courses are those which concern the objective purposes of teaching literature: that is, technology provides us with effective methods for presenting factual information to large numbers of people. The disadvantages are subjective in nature: mechanized teaching does not permit the student-teacher relationship that is needed to build an individual appreciation of literature.

Thus, it seems that the chief problem presented by the use of audio-visual aids arises from the failure to recognize them for what they are

and to use them accordingly. In the final analysis, they are mechanical aids to the teaching of literature; they are not substitutes for classroom teaching. And like already accepted mechanical aids—for example, books and periodicals—films, televised lectures, and recordings might well be used by students to increase their knowledge of literature.

Perhaps one way of solving the problem would be to divide college literature courses according to their objective and subjective elements. The purely factual information could then be presented to very large groups by audio-visual means. Because the subjective aspects of literature depend on the close association of student and teacher, the time thus saved could be devoted to small groups meeting with individual instructors. Presumably, to be effective, these groups, unlike the quiz sections found at present in large universities, would concentrate on such matters as appreciation, leaving the consideration of objective material to be presented technologically.

Unless some such method is devised to utilize technological aids effectively, the college teacher who believes in the importance of the personal element in the teaching of literature will fight a losing battle, if only because he cannot demonstrate quantitatively the value of student-teacher association. In American education the tendency is to emphasize the easily measured results. A pragmatically oriented policy-making or financing group faced with the task of providing instruction for a large number of students at a time when faculty members are scarce and funds limited is likely to minimize the value of the intangible elements that most literature teachers think important. Consequently, unless the college teacher can present a well-organized plan for assimilating new technological devices in his literature classes, he is likely to have them forced upon him, and to be compelled to use them in a manner that he believes has limited educational value for his students.

RICHARD H. BYRNS, *Southern Oregon College*

Editorial

The Community of Higher Education

The conditions of contemporary living have given fuller meaning to the concept of community. In the individualistic days of the frontier in America, community referred to little more than the area of one's residence. The improvement of transportation and communication gradually replaced the isolation of the early farming communities with the social complexity of the urban culture we know today. While these developments were occurring, the scientific study of the social structure was also making progress. It is probable that life in earlier days was less individualistic and more interlaced with community interests than had previously been supposed. In any event, the existence of these interests is now accepted as a basic datum, and research and interpretation are devoted to the manner of their interaction within the total social structure. A free society can perhaps be identified as one in which the rich fabric of personal interests and talents manifests itself in an equally complex pattern of interwoven communities. Some of these communities may be as wide as society itself; others may embrace but a few persons. Some may persist throughout life, giving the individual a strong sense of personal security within the social group; others may be transitory. In *The State of the Masses*, the late Emil Lederer, knowing both the pre-Nazi German society and its transformation under Adolf Hitler, contended that one of the most insidiously destructive aspects of the Nazi regime was its reduction of all of the smaller communities of a free society to the social masses of an authoritarian order.

With such a concept of community at our disposal, we can see that the social changes of current concern can be analyzed in terms of the strengthening and weakening of the subsidiary communities through which society functions. The discovery of atomic energy, for example, created new communities of interest among the nations of the world, and weakened or destroyed others. If we who are concerned with the humbler affairs of higher education may regard our focus of attention as being the center of such a community, we may first note that it is a dramatically growing one. More and more persons are concerned with higher education as potential or actual students, as parents of students, or as alumni. More and more persons are employed in higher education as teachers, investigators, officers, or administrative staff. These quantitative increases

have taken place not only absolutely but also in relation to our rapidly growing population. But these are not the most important aspects of the expansion of higher education. Along with quantitative growth, there is a qualitative growth that is more subtle and harder to elicit. The educational level of our people, which has risen continuously since the founding of the nation, has reached a point at which more of them operate at a level of intellectual performance for which higher education is an indispensable component. This means that higher education is progressively necessary as one lives his life, rather than merely as a preparation for it. Professional men return to their Alma Maters to be brought up to date on developments pertinent to their careers. Others return to develop further an interest recently acquired, or crowded out in the pressures of college years. Still others depend upon the research and service activities by which the inquiries of the campus are spread far and wide for all to use.

At the heart of this burgeoning community resides the professor. It is he who, as teacher and investigator, gives substance to the whole. If faculties are composed of perceptive individuals, eagerly pursuing the many facets of human awareness, the whole will grow. If they are not, the whole will languish, as it has in periods of the past. Many things are wrong with the free universities of the world; but it is also true that many things are right with them. Everywhere, demands upon higher educational institutions exceed their capacity to perform. This is hopeful rather than discouraging. It means that the social community of higher education is growing faster than its sources of nourishment. It will be a sad day indeed when the universities of the world have at hand the means to achieve all that they conceive to be worthy of achievement.

Thus far, at least in the Western world, the institutional communities of higher education have grown largely as a result of the excellences of the individuals who compose them. It is to the able teachers, investigators, and administrators that credit is due for the creation of the great higher educational institutions of the world. It is to be hoped that this condition may always prevail to some degree, but the pressures are now in the other direction. Higher education is less isolated from the cross-currents of life. Pressures which arise from the functioning of the great society without bear directly upon higher education and are felt within it. They cannot be avoided, and should not, if higher education is to be a significant community within the totality of communities; but they change the traditional role of the professor. It is no longer sufficient that he merely achieve excellence in his chosen scholarly field. He must also be concerned with the growing pains of the larger community of higher education within which he finds sustenance as well as spiritual support. He must—horror of horrors—be something of an organization man if he is to ensure his scholarly integrity as an individual. Individual freedom for the scholar, and the economic support thereof, without which personal freedom is an empty shell in the contemporary world, require

unity in the effort devoted to common problems of higher education. Administrators, of course, feel the social pressures which bear upon higher education. If they are left by their faculties to bear them alone, they will, on the one hand, be less effective than they might be with faculty help thoughtfully given; and on the other, they will be sure to think of professors as the hired help necessary to run "their" institutions. Professors have been known to complain of this condition. They bring it upon their own heads by their neglect of institutional community for scholarly diversity.

John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers of America, once said, "He who tooteth not his own horn, the same shall not be tooted." This is worth remembering as we who live for and are sustained by higher education find ourselves in the midst of the interlaced community pressures of a free society. Our society has looked upon us with favor; but the favor has brought more responsibility than means for its discharge. We cannot draw upon the favor for sustenance except as we can succeed in mobilizing the entire, expanded community of higher education, as an integrated unit, to represent the interests of higher education among the competing interests of the day. We are extremely fortunate to live in a society in which we are confronted with a problem of this kind. Nevertheless, it is time to integrate ourselves on a broader scale to cope with it.

Professors of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your provincialism. You have a world of respect—and even of affection—to win.

R. D. P.

The Reporter

Attitudes toward Evening Colleges

According to a study conducted in a seminar at University College, Rutgers University, attendance at an evening college is a matter of second choice. Most of the 415 respondents said that students who attend evening college do so because they cannot afford to attend day college on a full-time basis. Although half of those interviewed thought day and evening colleges were of equal quality, one-third rated day-college instruction as superior. Day-college degrees were believed to have greater prestige and to be preferred by industry. Day-college attendance was thought to provide students with more study time and cause less fatigue. However, evening-college students were rated above their daytime counterparts in terms of maturity and motivation. Many respondents erroneously believed that only business programs were offered in the evening. Most of them overestimated the cost of attending evening college. Ninety-two per cent believed that a college education was essential for men; 55 per cent thought a high-school education sufficient for women.

HARRY B. ROGGENBURG
University College,
Rutgers University

IN JULY, 1961, Antioch College will initiate a year-round, four-quarter schedule, with compulsory summer-quarter attendance. The student body will be divided into two groups, which will alternate their periods of study on campus and work off campus. Since only one group will be on the campus at a time, the new plan will enable the College to increase its enrollment from about 1,200 to 1,500 students without expanding its physical facilities or adding to the faculty. Study quarters will be eleven and one-half weeks long. There will be two weeks' vacation each summer, one week at Christmas, and four extra days every other year. The B.A. program will continue to require five years, on the average, for completion.

IN THE belief that young adults are interested in continuing their education after graduating from college, the 1960 chapter of Mortar Board at Northwestern University has developed a study guide for recent graduates. Suggested readings have been compiled by members of the faculty in the areas of English and American literature, history, journalism, political science, and psychology. It is hoped that succeeding chapters will continue this project and expand the areas of study.

FIFTEEN universities are participating in a new series of programs which is being broadcast this fall over the Voice of America. The programs are intended to provide information about American university life for students and educators in foreign countries. Four types of program have been prepared: brief talks, in their own languages, on study programs and daily life by foreign students who are

studying in the United States; round-table discussions conducted in Spanish in which both Latin and North American students participate; documentaries made by eight universities on the subject of their educational programs and activities; and short news reports about the most recent agricultural research for inclusion in Voice of America farm programs. The U. S. Information Agency posts abroad will place the programs, which are tape-recorded, on local stations or broadcast them by short wave.

A STUDY of the Class of 1960, conducted by the Harvard University Office of Student Placement, has revealed some interesting statistics. For the first time in the history of the College, more than half (52 per cent) of the graduating Seniors received their degrees with academic honors. Eight out of ten members of the class planned to continue their studies in graduate school immediately or in the fall. Most of those planning graduate work have applied to Harvard graduate schools, mainly in arts and sciences, medicine, and law. The Class of 1960 also did well in national competitions for post-graduate scholarships and fellowships: seven received Rhodes scholarships; six, Marshall scholarships; twenty, National Science Foundation fellowships; twenty-eight, Woodrow Wilson fellowships; twelve, Fulbright grants; and six, aid from the Government Grant Program.

A WEEKLY research seminar on international conflict and peace is being conducted at Washington University under the sponsorship of the Social Science Institute of the University during the fall semester. Scholars from Northwestern and Washington universities, the universities of California, Michigan, and Pittsburgh, and the Rockefeller Foundation have prepared papers on the social, economic, and psychological aspects of international conflict which will be discussed in the seminars. The program is directed toward graduate students and faculty members and is not open to the public. The papers will be made available sometime in 1961.

THE Graduate School of Louisiana State University has established a Master's-degree program in Latin-American studies. The program is designed to prepare students for careers in government, the foreign service, or business. Courses in the Latin-American aspects of the following fields are available: anthropology, finance-economics, geography, government, history, literature, and sociology. A Master's degree in Latin-American studies will be awarded to students completing a regular degree program, in which one major and two minor areas are studied and a thesis is written, or an optional program, in which two major areas are studied and no thesis is required. It is hoped that the program will eventually serve as a means of effecting an exchange of professors and students between Latin-American universities and those in this country.

A FOUR-YEAR project designed to improve the preparation of practicing and potential administrators of community and junior colleges has been begun by Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University. Special educational programs are in operation on the three campuses. Participants were selected from all over the United States, although preference was given to applicants from the Midwest. A State Co-ordinating Council for the project, composed of two representa-

tives from each university, has been established, and is studying the possibilities of co-operation in the use of specialized resources, in planning for student recruitment, and in research on the administration, programs, and placement of graduates of community colleges. The project is supported by grants from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

THE U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has announced in a report on the academic year 1959–60 that for the second consecutive year engineering enrollment has declined. Total enrollment was 3.9 per cent below that reported in the fall of 1958, and 6.3 per cent below that of 1957. The decline was the result of decreases in undergraduate enrollment, which was 5.9 per cent lower than in 1958, and 9.6 per cent lower than in 1957. Graduate enrollments in programs leading to the Master's and the Doctor's degrees, however, showed an increase. Increases in the number of engineering degrees conferred at all levels are still being reported, more degrees at each level being awarded in electrical engineering than in any other field.

AN ADAPTATION of the residential college plan of Oxford and Cambridge universities will be put into effect at Stephens College over a three-year period. The plan, which is an experiment in using residential facilities as a center for learning, will permit the College to develop new patterns in the use of the faculty and counseling staff, establish greater flexibility in class organization and scheduling, and place greater emphasis on independent study. During the three-year period, an integrated curriculum of general-education courses will be developed, and new instructional uses of closed-circuit television will be investigated.

One hundred students were selected to participate in the plan. They are taking a program of five courses, taught by five faculty members working closely together: General Humanities, Beginning Psychology, Contemporary Social Issues, Communication, and Ideas and Living Today. One of the faculty members lives in the residence hall and serves as residence counselor. The other four have offices in the hall and hold many of their classes there. The program is supported by the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

THE University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance and Commerce has received grants totaling $700,000 from the Ford Foundation for the improvement of business education. Projects include the development of new undergraduate courses; closer supervision of graduate students in general economics through a program of fellowships and released faculty time; expansion of research in such areas of business as insurance, marketing, finance, accounting, and industry; and the study of selected issues arising from the relationship of business activities and public policy.

IN ORDER to help meet the coming shortage of physicians in the Western states, the University of New Mexico is planning to establish a regional medical school which will cover the first two years of basic medical science. A grant of $1,082,300 from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation will enable the University to meet in part the costs of planning, housing, and operating the school for a five-year period. Arrangements will be made through the Student Exchange Program of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education for students from states other than New Mexico that do not have medical schools to take the first

two years of medical training at the new school. Students successfully completing the program will receive help in transferring to regular four-year schools for the remainder of their training.

FIVE economists from Carnegie and Massachusetts institutes of technology, Oberlin College, Princeton University, and the University of California at Berkeley have formed the National Task Force on Economic Education. Their project, which is sponsored by the Committee for Economic Development, is to describe "the minimum understanding of economics essential for good citizenship and attainable by high school students." The members of the task force were appointed by the American Economic Association. The group will be assisted by two persons from the field of secondary-school education, who will serve as consultants, and by many advisers throughout the country from the fields of economics and education.

THE University of California and Columbia and Harvard universities have received grants from the Ford Foundation which will enable them to establish their programs in non-Western studies as permanent parts of the curriculum. Also to be strengthened are related programs in such fields as public and business administration, law, public health, education, and international relations. The grants, totaling $15.1 million, will extend over a ten-year period.

THE University of Pittsburgh has established a demonstration center within the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs. The Center will provide advanced education for Americans preparing for overseas service in programs which are designed to foster rapid economic growth and social change in underdeveloped countries, particularly Asia, Africa, and Latin America. A grant from the Ford Foundation will enable the School to add permanent members to the faculty in the area of economic and social development, invite foreign scholars and administrators to teach special courses, broaden its course offerings, initiate research projects, and prepare and distribute teaching materials to other institutions and agencies. The School will also grant fellowships to Americans who already possess professional training and are interested in preparing for overseas service.

DURING the summer, the National Science Foundation supported programs in science education for 31,000 teachers and students with 1,000 grants to colleges, universities, and research institutions, which totaled $28 million.

A BOOKLET which describes the relatively new and still experimental graduate general-education programs in the humanities has been issued by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose of this report is to present descriptions of existing graduate programs in the humanities in terms which permit comparisons among programs, to provide useful information for institutions considering the establishment of such programs, and to furnish a basis for determining the extent and significance of these programs in graduate education. The booklet, *Graduate General Humanities Programs*, by Chester L. Neudling, may be obtained upon request from the U. S. Government Printing Office.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Readers are invited to submit items not exceeding two hundred words in length for "The Reporter." Those which are of general interest will be published with a caption and signature. They should deal with significant ideas, events, or experiences.

Reviews

A CENTURY OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN WOMEN, *by Mabel Newcomer.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. xii+266 pp. $5.00.

Do not judge a book by its cover. Dust-cover advertising is often misleading. Noting on the back flap that this volume is a "tribute to Vassar College," a reviewer feels misgivings; for many "tribute" books are disappointing to those outside the particular academic groves with which they deal.

Mabel Newcomer's book is, happily, a sharp contrast to conventional eulogistic volumes; and thus it does honor to the institution she has long served and to the author herself. This is not a history of Vassar: the crucial aspects of her role in women's higher education are set forth, but so are salient facts pertaining to higher education in other women's colleges, co-ordinate or affiliated colleges, private coeducational institutions, and state universities. References to Vassar are justifiably numerous, but Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Elmira, Mt. Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Wellesley, and the rest are not slighted.

This centennial volume, sponsored by the Vassar Committee on Publications, is a critical comparative analysis of trends in the higher education of women, interpreted in relation to hoary traditions and the changes that have taken place in American society. The book deals, among other matters, with coeducation and women's colleges; curriculums and extra-curricular activities; socio-economic, geographic, and other factors bearing on admission of women to college; paying the college bill; and the roles of women as artists, scholars, humble paid-workers, and unpaid participants in domestic life and civic affairs.

This is a critical, well-balanced, unbiased discussion of salient features of women's education as it has developed; therewith are mingled cogent comment and recommendations anent problems that require solution. Miss Newcomer hits hard. Some haymakers are aimed at educational foibles and suggested improvements in women's colleges and in public institutions: the proliferation of committees and busy work; teaching how to place chalk at blackboards and to beware of straggling hair; courses for certifying airline hostesses; the erroneous belief that women's colleges generally adapt more readily to women's interests than do others; the tendency to conformity, which cannot contribute to the chief end of liberal education (but, happily, strange ducklings do get through the fences that guard the women's colleges); the tendency of women to work beyond the home, which requires alteration of traditional views concerning liberal arts versus professional; the wastage of women's brain power; and the notion that women's colleges may have to turn coeducational or become extinct! Certain of these are doubtless designed to shock somnolent institutions into action. Where everyone presumes himself competent to pass educational judgments, there can

obviously be no general agreement with some of Miss Newcomer's views; yet she has gathered facts from acceptable sources which lend support to them.

The foregoing should not suggest that negative criticism is the hallmark of this volume. On the contrary, the positive contributions have due place. Women's colleges (notably Vassar) led in health and physical education, advanced self-government though they did not originate it, furthered art and music education, and produced more than their share of scholars.

Many facts in the book are familiar to those who keep an eye on the educational scene here and abroad. They need forceful repetition until something is done to remove the educational handicaps under which women now labor. Only a fourth of the women who could profit from college are in attendance; one in three hundred competent to obtain the doctorate actually does so; women taking the A.M. and Ph.D. declined sharply from 1920 to 1956; there is a decline of women as scholars. There is a loud cry for more qualified scientists. A factor in the decline of women pursuing the doctorate may deserve more stress than the author gives it: the many naturally endowed women who took the doctorate with distinction and yet found no employment on collegiate faculties. They were passed by, even by departments notoriously contemptuous of tradition, while less qualified men were appointed.

The book is well organized and well written, has seventeen tables, enough documentation, and an index. It should be read by all engaged in women's education. Able girls who are high-school Seniors would also find light shed upon the future paths they are considering.

THOMAS WOODY
University of Pennsylvania

THE DECLINE OF AMERICAN COMMUNISM: A HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1945, *by David A. Shannon*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1959. xiii+425 pp. $7.50.

On Friday, January 10, 1957, John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, resigned from the Communist party. He told a group of reporters that he was leaving "to rejoin the American people and find out what Americans are thinking about." Herein lies the central theme of *The Decline of American Communism*. The author gives proper emphasis to such factors in the Party's demise as prosperity, the cold war, and the general hostility of American society. He places a somewhat surprising emphasis on the rise of a new anti-Communist sentiment among liberals and political movements to the left of center. It is his opinion that the attacks by liberals hurt the Communists infinitely more than the extremist diatribes of conservatives.

The heart of the book lies in its analysis of the development of a Party program that was wholly unrelated to the facts of life in the United States. Democratic centralism as applied by William Foster became nothing more than decision-making by Foster and a hard core of his supporters. The Party reverted to positions that alienated it from both labor and the Negroes. It sought to dictate to trade unions and to use them for its own political purposes. It offended Negroes by advocating separate nationality, a program that smacked of the very segregation the Party attacked. It made hostility to religion a major plank at the very time that the American people gave themselves over to a kind of religiosity.

The greatest weakness of the Party lay in its obsession that the Soviet

Union was always right. The most recent line in Moscow became at once the Party line in the United States. Those who took issue within the Party found themselves quarantined because they were supposedly victims of a bourgeois virus. Consequently, the Party declined into an esoteric sect. Krushchev's denunciations of Stalin, followed by the uprisings in Poland and Hungary, split the Party once more, and again those who questioned Moscow were squeezed out. Those remaining had no following. They stood alone in American life, with only the Party franchise in their hands.

The author's clear style and perception make this an outstanding book. One puts it down with many questions coming to mind. How much has the Soviet regime learned about the dangers of controlling local Communist parties and dictating to them a line based on conditions as seen from Moscow? Has the presence of strong political parties elsewhere, capable of applying as much power as the Soviet party, curbed its arrogance? Or is a regime that rules by force at home inevitably going to dictate wherever and to whomever it can?

PAUL A. VARG
Michigan State University

FROM MAIN STREET TO THE LEFT BANK: STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS ABROAD, *by John A. Garraty and Walter Adams*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1959. x+216 pp. $4.00.

This is a well-written, objective evaluation of the numerous study and research programs set up for American students and professors in Europe since the Second World War. Instead of indulging in broad and unverifiable generalizations about the merits of these programs of study and teaching, the authors have wisely made use of the exact words of people interviewed —directors, students, teachers, townspeople—and have compiled this material, not statistically, but with a feeling for its human overtones, and so arrived at what seem like sound conclusions which lead to tentative suggestions for improvement. The book, it is hoped, will serve as a focus for the discussion of study abroad by those who are responsible for directing and developing it.

What is most strikingly pointed up, of course, is the contrast between European and American systems of higher education, especially the "guidance," coddling, and spoon-feeding in America, which often unfit the average undergraduate for the intellectual rigors of being forced in Europe to seek out the truth for himself and pursue it independently and relentlessly (pages 18, 22, 26–27). Fully recognizing the faults of the European system, the authors nevertheless feel that from it American educators can learn to place more academic responsibility on the shoulders of their students and not worry needlessly about those who cannot bear this burden.

> In Europe the general run must rise to this challenge or fall; those who fall may seek another type of training more suited to their abilities. We [in America] insist on either diluting the training for all or on dragging the weak along, stage by stage, credit by credit, quiz by quiz until a degree is "earned." The system is wasteful and unfair (page 202).

Two general recommendations are made, the wisdom of which will be at once apparent to anyone who has taught or studied abroad. The more solid and far-reaching the preparation (not merely a brief "orientation"), especially in what American culture owes to that of Europe, the easier will be the student's path in Europe, and the better ambassador he will prove to be. He is far less likely, armed with

this kind of cultural background and a usable knowledge of the language of his host country, to spend his time abroad huddled together with other Americans seeking protection against the awesome unfamiliarity of Europe, with its resultant "culture-shock." Parties given for Americans studying in France, for example, as reported by the authors, often resemble those described by E. M. Forster in *A Passage to India*, with the natives grouped together at one end of the room and the visitors at the other.

Specific recommendations concerning the organized study programs are made at the end of the book and in the appendix, where the foreign-study programs of such institutions as Smith, Hollins, Sweet Briar, Hamilton, and Princeton are analyzed and evaluated. These affirm that study rather than "broadening" should be emphasized; that perhaps graduate students derive more from the experience than undergraduates; that a minimum of a year should be allotted to the program if it is to be effective.

Even under ideal conditions of preparation and with a sincere attempt to fraternize with their European colleagues, Americans must not expect the outcome of foreign study to be spectacular, or that the face of either European or American education will be radically and immediately changed.

> . . . If Americans go to Europe to learn rather than to teach and if they work hard at learning, both about their subjects and about the life and culture of their hosts, they will inevitably achieve the maximum possible impact upon Europe. But it will be small at best. As individuals they cannot do much to anyone but themselves (page 188).

This note of realistic caution disposes the reader to feel that the whole treatment is eminently sound and well balanced. One cannot help thinking that Henry Adams would have approved of this frank and free discussion of many of the problems he confronted as an American student in Europe about a century ago.

MARGARET WILEY MARSHALL
Brooklyn College

THE COLLEGE INFLUENCE ON STUDENT CHARACTER, *by Edward D. Eddy, Jr.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959. xii+186 pp. $3.00.

In every branch of learning, educators today sense a geometrical rise in the problems of teaching and learning connected with the rapid expansion of knowledge. At the same time, men of learning seem deeply troubled with the realization that our most intractable human problems lie not so much in what is known (or unknown) as in awareness of basic human purposes and values and in measuring up to the challenge of these values. It is apparent that the twin problems of our society, (1) developing our intellectual power and (2) developing men and women of character who will use knowledge well, come to focus on the college campus.

The concept of the student mind and character that is sought after by the college is usually made crystal clear in the catalogue. Unfortunately, a check against the raw facts on almost any campus will confuse the issue. The gap here between aspiration and achievement is partly the price paid for lofty goals, but in part it undoubtedly results from a confusion of objectives and ineptitude in planning and executing necessary tasks. Almost any educator will admit this. The question in his mind, however, is how to remedy these shortcomings, given the nature of the present generation of students, teach-

ers, and administrators. Where and how can one take hold effectively in order to lift performance toward the levels required by the stated goals?

The book under review asserts persuasively that the college can take hold simply by expecting more of its students, by lifting a level of expectancy that too often fails to demand the degree of excellence of which students are capable. In "raising the level of expectancy of both students and faculty members . . . we can achieve cultivation of both mind and value—a dual goal of excellence," for "far from being antithetical," intellect and character "ideally proceed together in higher learning" (page vi).

As the author points out in this report, there is much more to a pervasive lifting of the sights than simply rewriting the catalogue. The volume deals with the nature of teaching, the organization of the curriculum, the degree of responsibility extended to and exercised by students, the opportunities for religious understanding and expression, and the more general influences of campus environment as factors through which excellence may be realized. The value of this report is greatly extended by its many vivid references to particular programs and by its quotations taken from student and faculty conversations on twenty selected campuses across the country. Those conversations were themselves unusual ones—partly because such vital elements in education as excellence or character or values are too rarely discussed by teachers with students or among students themselves; and partly because the conversations were initiated not only by Mr. Eddy but also by two young associates who apparently were highly successful in achieving rapport with students on the varying campuses on which they were temporarily resident.

Rather than a report of research, this volume is a spelling out, and a documenting by specific reference to practices and problems on twenty campuses, of a philosophy of education that links excellence of mind and of value, and that emphasizes at least the following additional principles:

1. The best mode of effectuating growth in learning, whether of teacher or student, is to let the individual become deeply and directly involved in the quest for knowing things that for him have significance.
2. Students and teachers and administrators have much to learn from each other—the "conversation" cannot be truly great if it is in fact a monologue.
3. Students are capable of responsible action as, in a sense, colleagues in an educational enterprise.
4. The social and "activity" life of the campus need not be an alternative to intellectual endeavor, in competition with it.
5. Higher levels of student effort and achievement may be attained by creating an effective expectation of them.

In this book, character is defined as "intelligent direction and purposeful control of conduct by definite moral principles" (page 2). By this definition, character will determine the quality of a man's scholarship just as it affects his response to worldly temptations. In the colleges there appears to be a growing acknowledgment that intellect and values, with which character is involved, are related, and that the college must be concerned with both. There will be little argument with the thought that in excellence, ability and purpose are linked. In coming to grips more directly with the challenge to achieve a higher level of expectation and of performance, educators and students alike will find stimulating and suggestive this thoughtful analysis and report of wisdom and practice from many campuses.

FRANK C. ABBOTT
Bucknell University

COLLEGE STUDENT GOVERNMENT, *by Gordon Klopf*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. xiii+105 pp. $3.50.

This is the fourth revised edition of a National Student Association publication originally entitled *Student Leadership and Government in Higher Education*. The contents are divided under three main headings: developing student leadership, student participation in college administration, and the college staff person and student groups. The material is treated in terms of both historical perspective and contemporary practice. All types of student participation in the broad areas of university administration and program are discussed, but these are not related to specifically identified colleges and universities. The methods of participation outlined are entirely theoretical; however, any college administrator reading the manual will find many echoes of systems and practices with which he is familiar. Throughout, the book follows the contemporary line that a modern philosophy of student participation means participation on a far broader base than simply the operation of dances, sports, and social activities.

In his excellent preface, Samuel Gould, although he agrees with this general concept, sounds a note of laudatory caution.

> To follow such a policy of involvement, however, does not mean abdication of authority on the part of the administration. On the contrary it sometimes means granite-like firmness, for the students will be eager to edge their way into territory that should be forbidden to them. And all such firmness should be founded upon the adherence to a single principle; there can be no authority without responsibility; the consequences of error cannot be ignored (page 10).

The many apparent strengths of the volume lie in such things as its sound appreciation of concepts of leadership, functions of student government, and the role of the student personnel worker and faculty man in student affairs. There is a fine terminal chapter, written in collaboration with Walter Pruitt, which contains some invaluable guidance, especially for the young worker in the student personnel vineyard. The Appendix contains an excellent model constitution, designed for a private Midwestern university of approximately 10,000 students. For this reviewer, the most disappointing section of the book was that dealing with student government in residence halls. This whole field, which has come so rapidly to the fore in the post-bellum era of university administration, is of overwhelming importance in the minds of personnel administrators, whether newcomers or "old China hands." In the entire volume only two pages are devoted to this most interesting subject, and in this amount of space obviously only the most cursory treatment could be expected.

It is to be hoped that any future edition of Mr. Klopf's book will contain a greatly expanded section on student government in both university-owned and privately operated residence halls, including co-operatives. Although the subject is admittedly complex and the practices vary widely, this very diversification would lend itself well to an analysis of categories and forms in residence-hall government. The concepts and policies expressed throughout the work are generally applicable, of course, to residence halls, but much more specific guidelines would be useful. Even without this, however, the book is a must for all of those who work with student government and student activities in colleges and universities

BYRON H. ATKINSON
University of California, Los Angeles

Books Received

ABERCROMBIE, M. L. JOHNSON. *The Anatomy of Judgment.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960. 156 pp. $4.50.

ADAM, THOMAS R. *Elements of Government: An Introduction to Political Science.* New York: Random House, 1960. x+468 pp. $6.75.

ADLER, JOSHUA. *Philosophy of Judaism.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1960. 160 pp. $3.00.

BABBIDGE, HOMER D., JR. *Student Financial Aid: Manual for Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1960. v+56 pp. (Student Personnel Series, No. 1). $1.50.

BENJAMIN, HAROLD, editor. *American Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960. xx+441 pp. $6.50.

BERTOCCI, PETER A. *Education and the Vision of Excellence.* Boston: Boston University Press, 1960. 32 pp. $.50.

BLEWETT, JOHN. *John Dewey: His Thought and Influence.* New York: Fordham University Press, 1960. xiv+242 pp. $5.00.

GOOD, CARTER V., editor. *Dictionary of Education.* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959. xxviii+676 pp. (McGraw-Hill Series in Education). $9.75.

HOLLAND, L. VIRGINIA. *Counterpoint: Kenneth Burke and Aristotle's Theories of Rhetoric.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1959. xvi+128 pp. $3.75.

KIRCHNER, WALTHER. *Western Civilization since 1500: Medieval and Modern Political, Cultural, and Social History.* New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1958. xx+360 pp. (College Outline Series). $1.95.

MUDRY, JOSEPH. *Philosophy of Atomic Physics.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1958. viii+136 pp. $3.75.

PAGNOL, MARCEL. *Topaze.* Translated by Rénée Waldinger. Great Neck, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1958. xi+146 pp. $.75.

RAAB, EARL, and LIPSET, SEYMOUR M. *Prejudice and Society.* New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1959. 48 pp. $.35.

from Philosophical Library

Psychology and Education

By Hirsch Lazaar Silverman

Professor of Psychology and Chairman of the Department of Educational and School Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University

This important and provocative collection of papers is concerned with securing a greater measure of democracy in the schools, and creating a more intelligent way of life. Based on Dr. Silverman's experience in teaching and in private practice, the essays range over the psychological aspects of discipline and religion in education, and the relationship between philosophy and psychology. Discussions of Existentialism as a contemporary philosophy and the psychological implications in Platonic philosophy are also included. Clear and incisive, this book is a notable contribution to the role psychology continues to play in the advancement of education. $3.75

You can expedite shipment by enclosing remittance

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

15 East 40th Street

New York 16, N. Y.

RACINE, JEAN. *Phaedra.* Translated by Bernard D. N. Grebanier. Great Neck, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1958. xiv+92 pp. $.75.

REISS, SAMUEL. *Language and Psychology.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1959. xii+299 pp. $3.75.

RUBINSTEIN, ALVIN Z., editor. *The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union.* New York: Random House, 1960. xviii+457 pp. $6.50.

SCHILLER, FRIEDRICH. *Mary Stuart.* Translated by Sophie Wilkins. Great Neck, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1959. xv+166 pp. $.95.

SHEPARD, NATALIE MARIE. *Foundations and Principles of Physical Education.* New York: Ronald Press Company, 1960. ix+352 pp. $5.00.

SYRETT, HAROLD C., editor. *American Historical Documents.* New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960. xiv+427 pp. (College Outline Series). $2.25.

THOMPSON, JAMES D. *et al. Comparative Studies in Administration.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959. xiv+224 pp. $6.00.

TRAXLER, ARTHUR E., editor. *Long-Range Planning for Education: A Report of the Twenty-second Educational Conference . . . Held under the Auspices of the Educational Records Bureau and the American Council on Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1958. x+186 pp. $2.00.

WEBER, CHRISTIAN O. *Basic Philosophies of Education.* New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1960. x+333 pp. $4.50.

Academic Round Table

Readers are invited to submit topics for discussion in this department. Deadline for the "Academic Round Table" in the April, 1961, *Journal* is January 15, 1961.

Topics for February, March, and April, with suggestive questions pertinent to them are as follows:

February, 1961

Should a national board of review be established to evaluate the quality of Ph.D. dissertations at various institutions?

See "The Administration of the Ph.D. Degree," by Robert Ferber, which appears on page 384 of the October issue of the JOURNAL.

March, 1961

Is consolidation among textbook publishers a threat to authors?

Has consolidation gone far enough to have become a serious matter?

If it has, is freedom of expression restricted for potential authors, and freedom to read for students who might have profited from their writings?

Have the university presses a place in textbook publishing in the current state of the industry?

April, 1961

What qualities should a good graduate student possess?

Is previous academic record a sufficient base for determining admission to graduate work?

How early can the potentially good graduate student be detected?

Are we wasting space in our graduate schools by admitting an excessive number of unqualified students?